

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 061

JC 740 012

AUTHOR Mitchell, Marlene
TITLE Evaluation of the 1973 Summer Institute of the Ed.D.
Program for Community College Faculty.
INSTITUTION Nova Univ., Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
PUB DATE [73]
NOTE 180p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; *Doctoral
Programs; Evaluation Techniques; Higher Education;
Participant Characteristics; *Participant
Satisfaction; Post Secondary Education; Professional
Continuing Education; *Program Evaluation;
Questionnaires; Statistical Data; Summer Institutes;
Surveys; Tables (Data)

IDENTIFIERS Needs Assessment Questionnaire; Summer Institute
Survey

ABSTRACT

The results of a survey conducted to ascertain the participants' evaluation of the first Summer Institute of the Ed.D. Program for Community College Faculty are provided. A total of 241 institute participants, 74% of the 325 registrants, completed the "Summer Institute Survey." The analysis of the survey data is provided in 79 tables, and is discussed. Copies of the Needs Assessment Questionnaire and Summer Institute Survey form are provided, as is a sample participant letter. Survey findings are summarized, and conclusions are given. (DB)

ED 085061

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EVALUATION OF THE 1973 SUMMER INSTITUTE
OF THE Ed.D. PROGRAM FOR COMMUNITY
COLLEGE FACULTY

Dr. Marlene Mitchell
Assistant Professor of Education
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

JC 740 012

Program Director: Dr. John A. Scigliano
Nova University
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. METHOD	3
A. Sample	
B. Procedures	
III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	11
IV. SUMMARY	38
V. CONCLUSIONS	43
VI. APPENDIX	
A. Needs Assessment Questionnaire	
B. Summer Institute Survey	
C. Tables	
Question 1: 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 5A, 5B	
Question 2: 6A, 6B	
Question 3: 7A, 7B	
Question 4: 8A, 8B	
Question 5: 9A, 9B	
Question 6: 10A, 10B	
Question 7: 11A, 11B	
Question 8: 12A, 12B	
Question 9: 13A, 13B	
Question 10: 14A, 14B	
Question 11: 15A, 15B	
Question 12: 16A, 16B	
Question 13: 17A, 17B	
Question 15: 19A, 19B, 20A, 20B, 21A, 21B	

TABLE OF CONTENTS continued

Question 16: 22A, 22B

Question 17: 23A, 23B, 24A, 24B, 25A, 25B

Question 18: 26A, 26B, 27A, 27B, 28A, 28B

Question 22: 29, 29A, 29B, 30, 30A, 30B,
31, 31A, 31B, 32, 32A, 32B, 33,
33A, 33B

Question 24: 34A, 34B

Question 25: 35A, 35B

Question 26: 36A, 36B

Question 27: 37A, 37B

Question 29: 38A, 38B

D. Sample Participant Letter

LIST OF FIGURES	Page
Figure 1: Rankings by Cluster	13
Figure 2: Cluster Comparisons	21
Figure 3: Inter-cluster Communication	28
Figure 4: Adequacy of Facilities	32

I. INTRODUCTION

An evaluation of the first Summer Institute of the Ed.D. Program for Community College Faculty can serve two important functions: (1) Provide an indication of how participants reacted to the activities of the 1973 Summer Institute; and (2) be used as a planning tool for the 1974 Summer Institute in which about twice as many community college faculty are expected to be involved as were involved this year.

Frequently, the results of evaluation activities are not shared in a meaningful way with those who participate in the research. The Nova University staff is committed to conducting research and evaluation in a "symbiotic" relationship with all participants. A "symbiotic" research and evaluation relationship is particularly important in a program which emphasizes and encourages feedback from its participants, and which has as one of its components the development of research and evaluation skills. Therefore, copies of this report are being sent to all clusters as well as to the national lecturers and members of the advisory board.

In an attempt to assess participants' needs and expectations for the 1973 Summer Institute, a questionnaire (Appendix A) was sent to all program participants about one month prior to the Summer Institute. This questionnaire asked participants to list: (1) Their most pressing

questions about (a) general program structure, (b) seminars with national lecturers and (c) practicums; (2) their single, most important objective for the Institute; and (3) any other expectations they might have for the Institute. The responses were grouped within categories (i.e., 1a-c, 2 and 3) within each cluster. The schedule of activities for the 1973 Summer Institute were examined so that necessary adjustments could be made prior to the Institute. In addition, the Nova staff and national lecturers met on the day preceding the start of the Institute and included in their discussions the objectives cited by participants.

II. METHOD

A. Sample

Two hundred forty one Summer Institute participants, or 74%¹ of 325 registrants, completed the Summer Institute Survey (Appendix B). Of the 93% who indicated their present position, 38% of the respondents are in administration, 22% in Behavioral Science, 33% in Curriculum and Instruction, and 7% in Engineering Technology.

Respondents represent all 13 clusters: 1% of the respondents are from Broward County, Florida; 11% from Chicago, Illinois; 6% from Hampton, Virginia; 9% from Hillsborough, Florida; 11% from Jacksonville, Florida; 6% from Long Island, New York; 11% from Miami-Dade, Florida; 8% from New Haven, Connecticut; 10% from Orlando, Florida; 2% from Pensacola, Florida; 8% from Sacramento, California; 8% from St. Petersburg, Florida; and 10% from San Francisco, California.

B. Procedures

Summer Institute Surveys (Appendix B) were distributed to participants at an afternoon general session on Friday, August 11. Cluster coordinators

¹Note: all reported percentages are rounded off to nearest whole number.

collected the completed surveys and submitted them to the Nova University staff either Friday evening or Saturday morning. Reactions to a concurrent session (Friday); the Friday night banquet, and a general session (Saturday) may, therefore, not be included in the data. The decision to distribute and collect surveys prior to the end of the final general session was made to maximize the response rate, since some participants could not be present for the Saturday session.

The data from five questionnaires mailed to Nova University after the conclusion of the Institute are not included since processing of the data was begun immediately following the Institute. All computer processing of the data was performed by Dennis Murphy at the Computer Center of Nova University.

The following procedures were used to analyze the data:

- (1) Cross-tabulation of question responses and group membership (cluster and present position), which shows the percentage of persons in each category who indicate a particular response;²
- (2) Calculation of Pearson's Chi-Square Test of Association, which indicates whether or not the categories (response and group membership) are

²Murphy, Dennis. Cross-Tabulation Program With Histogram and Non-Parametric Options. (Original Program by Richard LaRue). Fort Lauderdale, Fla.: Nova University Computer Center, 1973.

independent;³ and

- (3) Calculation of the Symmetric Lambda which indicates that the probability of error in predicting one attribute from another is reduced by a given percentage with knowledge of either attribute.⁴ Interpretation of the Symmetric Lambda in this report is based only on the probability of reducing the percentage of error in predicting the participant's response (column or criterion) from group membership (row or predictor).

The data for each question are reported as percentages of participants within each category who indicated a particular response to a survey question.

There are two tables⁵ for each question or question section.⁶ In order to facilitate interpretation of the tables, the following explanation is given.

(1) Cross-Tabulation of Question Responses and Group Membership (Position, Cluster):

The A Tables (e.g. Table 1A) are crossbroken by the present position (Administration, Behavioral Science, Curriculum and Instruction, Engineering Technology), Rows

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵All tables appear in Appendix C.

⁶Some questions have several sections. For example, question 17 has 3 sections. Therefore, there are six (6) tables for question 17. For question 22, adequacy of facilities for specific Institute activities, only one table (total or pooled population) is provided for each question section.

1-4, of the participant and his or her response (Columns 1, 2 . . . etc.) to the question.

The B Tables (e.g. Table 1B) are crossbroken by the cluster of which the respondent is a member (e.g., Long Island, St. Petersburg, San Francisco), Rows 1-13, and his or her response (Columns 1, 2 . . . etc.) to the question.

In all tables (A and B), the Row (Rows Represent) and Column (Columns Represent) definitions are provided at the top of each table. The column definition states the question and all possible responses to the question.

For each possible combination of responses, the following information is given:

- a. Cell Frequency (CELL FREQ)
- b. Percent of Row (% ROW)
- c. Percent of Column (% COL)
- d. Percent of Table (% TABLE)

Cell Frequency (CELL FREQ) represents the number of respondents in a given group who indicated the same response. For example, in Question 1, "Did you room at the Diplomat during the Summer Institute", Table 1A, Cell 1,1 shows that 68 (CELL FREQ) or 81% (% ROW) of respondents in Administration roomed at the Diplomat, that these respondents represent 40.5% (% COL) of all respondents who roomed at the Diplomat and that these 68 persons are 31.9% (% TABLE) of all participants who responded to the

question, whether or not they roomed at the Diplomat.

The totals for each row are given opposite each cell frequency (CELL FREQ) under the column labeled TOTALS. In the table cited previously, 84 participants in Administration responded to the question about rooming at the Diplomat. These 84 persons represent 39.4% of all respondents to the question.

Total column frequencies (TL COL FREQ) represent the total number of persons indicating the same response. For example, in Table 1A, column 1, 168 persons or 78.87% of all respondents to the question, roomed at the Diplomat during the Summer Institute.

The lower right-hand corner of each table indicates the total number of persons responding to the question. Table 1A shows that 213 persons responded to the question.

(2) Calculation of Pearson's Chi-Square Test of Association:

The Pearson Chi-Square Test of Association⁷ was calculated for each table in order to obtain an index of association between two categorical variables, the group membership (i.e., cluster or present position) and the response (reported as percentages). However, as Hays and Winkler⁸ point out:⁹

⁷Formula 12.5.2, in Hays, W.L. and Winkler, R.L. Statistics: Probability, inference, and decision. (Vol. II) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970, p. 198.

⁸Hays, W.L. and Winkler, R.L., op. cit.

⁹Note: χ^2 =chi-square and λ =Lambda in the following quotation.

When the value of x^2 turns out significant, one can say with confidence that the attributes A and B are not independent. Nevertheless, the significance level alone tells almost nothing about the strength of association. Usually we want to say something about the predictive strength of the relation as well. If there is the remotest interest in actual predictions using the relation studied, then the measures are worthwhile. Statistical relations so small as to be almost nonexistent can show up as highly significant x^2 results, and this is especially likely to occur when sample size is large. All too often the researcher then "kicks himself" into thinking that he has discovered some relationship which will be applicable in some real-world situation. Plainly, this is not necessarily true. The indices do, however, suggest just how much the relationship found implies about real predictions and how much one attribute actually does tell us about the other. Such indices are a most important correction of the tendency to confuse statistical significance with the importance of results for actual prediction. Virtually any statistical relation will show up as highly significant given a sufficient sample size, but it takes a relation of considerable strength to enhance our ability to predict in real, uncontrolled, situations. It can happen that even though a x^2 test is significant, the predictor's behavior is not changed one whit by this new information. The measures show how one is led to predict differentially in the light of the relationship. (p. 213-214)

(3) Calculation of the Symmetric Lambda:

An additional index was computed, the Symmetric Lambda¹⁰, which provides an indication of the ability of one category to predict another. The Symmetric Lambda says that knowledge of either classification (e.g. group

¹⁰Hays, W.L. and Winkler, R.L., op. cit., p. 213.

membership or response) "improves our ability to predict the other category, in that the probability of error is reduced"¹¹ by the percentage obtained. For example, if computation of the Pearson's Chi-Square Test of Association yields a significance figure of .01, we know that two categories are not independent. The Symmetric Lambda obtained, however, may be 1% when predicting, for example, response from group membership (e.g., cluster). A Lambda of 1% does not indicate a very strong relationship; that is, knowledge of group membership does not considerably improve our ability to predict the response, since the probability of error of prediction is reduced by only 1%.

The results of Pearson's Chi-Square Test of Association and the Symmetric Lambda accompany all tables in which the assumptions for calculation of chi-square are met. Only those indices which seem to indicate a strong association (or Lambda) will be discussed. In other words, significant Chi-Square Tests of Association ($P=.01$) will be discussed when the Lambda obtained indicates a strong relationship between the two attributes.

Analysis of the data is presented in the Results and Discussion section. Some questions are grouped for discussion purposes (e.g., questions 4-6, having to do with participants' Institute costs). In addition, where

¹¹Ibid.

appropriate, sample open-ended responses are included to facilitate interpretation of the tables. For example, questions 3, 7, 8, 15 and 23-28 provide respondents with an opportunity to explain their response choices.

Also included, where applicable, is information provided the evaluator in conversations with participants during the Summer Institute.

Several questions did not apply to all respondents. For example, Question 3 instructs the person to skip to question 4 if he or she does not have any children. Therefore, the large number of missing data on some questions reflect the fact that the question was not applicable to all survey participants.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Question 1: Did you room at the Diplomat during the Summer Institute? (Tables 1A, 1B)

- a. If Yes:
Were the facilities adequate? (Tables 2A, 2B)
Was the food to your liking? (Tables 3A, 3B)
- b. If No:
Did you stay with friends or relatives?
(Tables 4A, 4B)
Did you stay at a different hotel?
(Tables 5A, 5B)

Most participants (c. 78%) stayed at the Diplomat Hotel during the Summer Institute (Tables 1A, 1B). As might be expected, there is a strong relationship between the cluster membership of the participant (Table 1B) and whether or not he or she roomed at the Diplomat ($\lambda = 36\%$). However, a stronger relationship might have been predicted. It is interesting to note, for example, that 19% of respondents from the Miami-Dade cluster (Table 1B), which is within easy commuting distance of the hotel, stayed at the Diplomat. Also, only 50% of respondents from Pensacola (Table 1B) roomed at the Institute headquarters.

Some respondents (c. 33%) who did not room at the Diplomat hotel stayed with friends or relatives (Tables 4A, 4B) or at another hotel (19%; Tables 5A, 5B). Conversations with Institute participants indicated that another response option should have been provided in the Survey: KOA Campgrounds. Several participants indicated that they were staying at Camp-sites, that, in fact, they had had difficulty locating camp-sites close to the Institute.

Those who stayed at the Diplomat hotel seemed quite pleased with the facilities (94%; Tables 2A,2B) and somewhat less pleased with the food (60%; Tables 3A,3B). The large numbers not responding to "Was the food to your liking?" may reflect the fact that many people who roomed at the Diplomat did not have their meals on the hotel premises. Many persons indicated on their surveys that the food was too expensive.

Question 2: Did your spouse come with you to the Summer Institute? (Tables 6A,6B)

Question 3: Did any of your children come with you to the Summer Institute? (Tables 7A,7B)

About 35% of the respondents to question 2 (Tables 6A,6B) brought their spouses with them to the Summer Institute, and about 27% of those responding to question 3 brought their children (Tables 7A,7B).

It is interesting to note, when clusters are considered, that the rankings by cluster of those who brought spouses and those who brought children, are very similar. Figure 1 shows the relative rankings (data obtained from Tables 6B and 7B).

Figure 1
Rankings by Cluster

Spouse (Table 6B)		Children (Table 7B)	
Cluster #	%	Cluster #	%
4	54.5	8	87.5
12	50.0	10	66.7
10	50.0	4	43.8
8	50.0	12	40.0
5	42.3	5	37.5
13	41.7	6	33.3
6	35.7	2	25.0
9	34.8	13	18.8
3	26.7	9	15.8
7	24.0	3	14.3
2	20.8	7	5.3
11	5.3	11	0.0
1	0.0	1	0.0

It should also be noted that chi-square is significant ($P=.01$) for Table 7B and there is a fairly strong relationship between the cluster membership and whether children accompanied the respondent ($\lambda=17\%$). The six clusters obtaining the highest rankings were from the northeast states (New Haven, Connecticut; Long Island, New York) and from within the state of Florida (Pensacola, Hillsborough, St. Petersburg, Jacksonville).

Question 4: Who is paying for your participation in the Summer Institute? (Tables 8A,8B)

Question 5: How much do you estimate that the Summer Institute has cost you? (Tables 9A,9B).
(Please don't include expenses for spouse or children).

Question 6: Did you borrow money from a federally insured loan to help pay for your costs for the Summer Institute? (Tables 10A,10B)

About ninety-eight percent of survey respondents paid

the total cost of the Institute themselves (Tables 8A,8B). The respondents who indicated that they are paying a portion of the total cost and their school is paying a portion are from the Miami-Dade (8%) and Orlando (13%) clusters (Table 8B).

As might be expected in question 5, the chi-square for cluster membership is significant ($P=.01$, Table 9B), indicating that there is a significant relationship between the cluster location and estimated Institute costs. It should also be noted that in predicting the cost response (column) from cluster membership (row), the value of lambda is only 29% (Table 9B). An examination of the table shows that respondents from most clusters indicated a range of cost responses, although more people in a cluster may have estimated the Institute cost within one category more than other categories. For example, cost responses for the Chicago cluster varied from \$201-\$300 (response 4) to more than \$500 (response 7), although more people (29.2%) estimated \$201-\$300 than any other amount.

Further, while respondents within a cluster may have indicated a range of responses, the distribution of responses within one cluster category tend to be within a narrow range (Table 9B). For example, respondents from Sacramento indicated responses 5-7 while those from Orlando indicated responses 2-4.

Thirteen persons or 6% of respondents (Tables 10A,10B)

borrowed money from a federally insured loan to help pay Institute costs, two in administration, six in behavioral science, one in curriculum and instruction and four in engineering technology (Table 10A). However, a higher percentage of Engineering Technology respondents (29%; Table 10A) than respondents in other position categories (2%-12%) responded positively to question 6. The respondents who borrowed money from a federally insured loan are distributed through nine of the thirteen clusters (Table 10B), with Sacramento having the highest percentage (22%).

Question 7: In your opinion, was one week long enough for the Summer Institute? (Tables 11A,11B)

Ninety-six percent of all survey respondents (Tables 11A,11B) felt that one week was long enough for the Summer Institute. An examination of respondents' surveys indicates that some of those persons who responded No to question 7, felt that the Institute should have been shorter, or 3-4 days in length.

Question 8: How long did you (or will you) stay in South Florida? (Tables 12A,12B)

Most respondents (71%; Tables 12A,12B) stayed in Florida just for the Summer Institute. However, at least some respondents in each the eleven clusters not located in South Florida stayed in South Florida for additional days (6%-46%; Table 12B). The Chicago (44%), Long Island (46%)

and New Haven (43%) clusters have the highest percentages of participants who spent additional days in South Florida.

A tally of responses to the number of additional days indicates a range of one day to two weeks longer than the Institute, with most respondents indicating one additional day. It is likely that, since the Institute was six days in length, many persons stayed at least one extra day (or as many as 14 extra days) to qualify for airline excursion rates (at least 7 days, not more than 21 days) which are less expensive than regular airline rates.

Question 9: In your opinion, when is the best time to schedule the next Summer Institute? (Tables 13A, 13B)

Although there were nine response choices to question 9, asking participants to indicate their preference for the scheduling of next year's Summer Institute, early August was chosen by more than 60% of the respondents (Tables 13A, 13B). Table 13A shows that 60% or more of persons in all positions prefer early August. Some differences in preference can be seen when respondents are grouped by clusters (Table 13B). For example: (1) Pensacola participants show a preference for early June (66.7%); (2) only 31.6% of the Chicago participants selected early August; and (3) Long Island participants were evenly divided among late June, early July, early August and late August.

It should also be noted that there were a large number

of non-respondents to this question (Tables 13A,13B). This may indicate that many persons have no preference, that their preference was not included as a response option, or that they were reacting to an announced commitment for next year required of the Nova staff during the week of the Institute by hotel personnel. Since the announcement was made at a general session, it is, in fact, quite likely that those who selected early August are endorsing the time commitment.

Question 10: Did you have enough free time during the Summer Institute? (Tables 14A,14B)

When respondents are grouped by present position, 60%-74% indicate that they had enough free time during the Institute (Tables 14A). Conversations with Institute participants indicated that some persons would have also liked scheduled, optional evening activities such as open discussion groups on selected topics (possibly chaired by participants) or "sensitivity" group sessions.

When respondents are grouped by cluster membership, 44%-100% indicate that they had enough free time during the Institute (Table 14B). Although there is not a strong relationship ($\lambda=5\%$; Table 14B) between cluster membership and the response to question 10, there are significant differences attributable to cluster membership ($P=.01$; Table 14B). It is possible that the wide range of responses (46 percentage points) reflects the feelings of

persons who would like to have spent more time exploring the physical environment of Florida.

Question 11: How would you rate the Summer Institute?
(Tables 15A,15B)

Whether respondents are grouped by present position (Table 15A) or cluster membership (Table 15B), 89% rate the Summer Institute as either excellent or good. However, it should be noted that there is a significant ($P=.01$; Table 15B) and quite strong relationship ($\lambda=20\%$; Table 15B) between rating of the Institute and cluster membership.

Sixty-six percent to 100% of respondents within the 13 clusters rated the Institute excellent or good. An examination of the responses of the 13 clusters shows great variability in a single response category. For example, 16% of persons in one cluster rated the Institute as excellent, while 100% of persons in other clusters indicated an excellent rating (Table 15B).

That only 11% of the total survey respondents (and no more than 24% in any one cluster) indicated that the Institute was either fair or poor (Table 15B) would seem to show that respondents were generally pleased with the first Summer Institute of the program.

Question 12: Would you prefer to attend a regional Summer Institute (for example, in California, New York or Ft. Lauderdale) rather than a national institute? (Tables 16A,16B)

Most respondents (about 72%; Tables 16A,16B) would not prefer to attend a regional Summer Institute rather than a national institute. Those clusters with higher percentages indicating a preference for a regional institute are, for the most part, those clusters most distant from Fort Lauderdale (Table 16B).

Some general comments at the end of the survey related directly to question 12. Several respondents indicated that the 1973-1974 Summer Institute should elaborate or build upon the concepts, awarenesses and strategies of the 1972-1973 Institute, that the program should not be repeated for the benefit of new participants. Several respondents who indicated preference for a regional institute rather than a national institute noted on their surveys that they preferred a regional (separate) institute if the 1973-1974 program was basically an orientation for new clusters.

Question 13: Would you want to attend a Summer Institute again next year? (Tables 17A,17B)

Whether respondents are grouped by present position (Table 17A) or cluster membership (Table 17B), 94% would want to attend a Summer Institute again next year. At least 93% of persons in each of the four position categories

indicated an affirmative response (Table 17A), while at least 88% of persons in each of the 13 cluster categories would want to attend again next year (Table 17B).

It should be noted in Table 17B that two of the clusters having the largest percentage of persons who would not want to attend again next year, Sacramento (11%) and San Francisco (13%) had the highest percentage of respondents indicating that the Summer Institute cost them more than \$500 (Table 9B).

It is also possible that, in some clusters, intent to return to the Summer Institute in 1973-74 is influenced by the rating of the Institute (Table 15B). For example, Figure 2 shows that clusters 2, 6, 11 and 12 had the highest percentage of respondents ranking the Institute fair or poor and were among the clusters with the highest percentage of respondents who would not want to return to the Summer Institute next year. Clusters 2, 6 and 11 also are among those clusters with the largest percentage of persons estimating the cost of the Institute at more than \$500 (Figure 2).

It should be noted here that 98% of all respondents paid the total cost of the Summer Institute themselves. Therefore, that 94% would want to attend one next year might be interpreted as a very high percentage.

Figure 2

<u>Cluster Comparisons</u>				
<u>Cluster #</u>	<u>% Rating Institute Excellent or Good</u>	<u>% Rating Institute Fair or Poor</u>	<u>% Indicating Cost more than \$500</u>	<u>% Indicating would not want to return 73-74</u>
1	100	0	0	0
2	76	24	21	8
3	100	0	7	0
4	86	14	0	0
5	100	0	0	4
6	79	21	23	8
7	84	16	4	4
8	89	11	29	6
9	100	0	0	4
10	100	0	0	0
11	79	21	39	11
12	81	19	0	11
13	96	4	30	13

Question 15: Were your most pressing questions about each of the following areas answered during the Summer Institute?

General Program Structure (Tables 19A,19B)

Seminars with National Lecturers (Tables 20A,20B)

Practicums (Tables 21A,21B)

Most respondents felt their most pressing questions about the three program areas specified in the survey were answered during the Summer Institute (General Program Structure, 90%, Tables 19A and B; Seminars with National Lecturers, 89%, Tables 20A and B; Practicums, 95%, Tables 21A and B).

It should be noted in Tables 19A, 20A and 21A that a higher percentage of respondents in Engineering Technology than in any other position category felt that their most

pressing questions were not answered, although in no case was the chi-square test of association significant.

Respondents were asked to list questions they still had if their most pressing questions were not answered in each of the three areas specified. Questions about general program structure relate primarily to the dissertation. Some specific concerns about the dissertation are: (1) Selection of an advisor and the possibility of selecting an advisor at this point in the program rather than in the third year; (2) the format of the dissertation; and (3) the length of time in which a participant must complete the dissertation. Other questions about general program structure related to the amount of structure (e.g., prescription of course of study), flexibility and opportunity for individuality within the program. The third area of questions related to clarification and definition of the Engineering Technology specialization.

Questions about seminars with national lecturers relate primarily to: (1) The size of lecture groups (i.e., too large); (2) scheduling cluster visits of national lecturers; and (3) selection of national lecturers for cluster visits.

The areas of concern related to Practicums are: (1) Requirements for practicums during the third year (i.e., will two practicums be required in addition to the dissertation); and (2) the possibility of initiating a

practicum after completion of a module (i.e., it is sometimes difficult to develop a practicum proposal in an area of new knowledge concurrent with participation in the module area).

Question 16: Overall, which sessions did you enjoy most?
(Tables 22A,22B)

Both general and concurrent sessions were enjoyed equally well by approximately 58% of the survey respondents (Tables 22A,22B). Although there is a significant ($P=.01$) but very weak relationship ($\text{Lambda}=0\%$) between present position and sessions most enjoyed (Table 22A), it should be noted that none of the Educational Technology respondents enjoyed the general sessions most.

Question 17: Did you personally have an opportunity to speak with (or ask questions of) national lecturers and session speakers:

During General Sessions (Tables 23A,23B)
During Concurrent Sessions (Tables 24A,24B)
Outside Scheduled Sessions (Tables 25A,25B)

Question 17 shows an interesting pattern. Most survey respondents (about 93%; Tables 24A,24B,25A,25B) personally had an opportunity to speak with (or ask questions of) national lecturers and session speakers during concurrent sessions as well as outside scheduled sessions, while about 56% (Tables 23A,23B) had this opportunity during general sessions.

No chi-square tests of association were significant

for present position (Tables 23A,24A,25A) or cluster membership (Tables 23B,24B,25B), indicating that, in this study, the respondent's perceived opportunity to interact with lecturers and speakers cannot be predicted by his or her present position or cluster membership.

However, in all three sections of question 17, general sessions, concurrent sessions and outside scheduled sessions, more respondents in administration than in any other position category indicated that they had an opportunity to speak with (or ask questions of) session speakers and lecturers (Tables 23A,24A,25A). Further, Table 23A shows that fewer respondents in Educational Technology than persons in other position categories indicated that they had an opportunity to interact with lecturers and session speakers during general sessions (Educational Technology, 33%; other Position Categories, 50%-67%). Table 24A shows the same pattern of interaction for concurrent sessions (Educational Technology, 77%; other Position Categories, 90%-97%).

It should also be noted that the number of non-respondents to question 17 is highest when asked about communication with lecturers and session speakers during general sessions and lowest when asked about communication with identified persons outside scheduled sessions.

Question 18: Did you personally have an opportunity to speak with (or ask questions of) participants from other clusters:

During General Sessions (Tables 26A,26B)
During Concurrent Sessions (Tables 27A,27B)
Outside Scheduled Sessions (Tables 28A,27B)

Question 18 shows an expected pattern. Most respondents had more opportunity to communicate with participants from other clusters outside scheduled sessions (98%; Tables 28A,28B) than during concurrent sessions (87%; Tables 27A,27B) or during general sessions (74%; Tables 26A,26B). Interestingly, as in question 17, responses to all three sections of question 18 have no significant relationship to either the present position or cluster membership of the respondent. This would seem to indicate that opportunity to interact with other participants (and lecturers and session speakers) in a range of situations, that is, structured (general sessions), somewhat structured (concurrent sessions) and unstructured (outside scheduled sessions) may have been: (1) facilitated by the program, scheduling pattern and physical facilities of the Summer Institute; (2) deliberately created by the participants themselves; and (3) encouraged by the behavior of national lecturers, session speakers and the Nova staff.

As in question 17, which asks about interaction with session speakers and national lecturers, the number of non-respondents to question 18 decreases when asked about communication with participants during general sessions to

communication outside scheduled sessions.

Respondents were asked to indicate in Question 14 (See Survey, Appendix B): (1) The number of participants with whom they communicated for specific activities prior to the Summer Institute; and (2) the number of participants with whom they intended to communicate for specific activities as a result of the Summer Institute. Analysis of Question 14 (Figure 3)¹² is included in this section because it documents further patterns of interaction during the Institute.

Figure 3 shows that, for 12 of the 13 clusters responding to question 14: (1) Respondents in all clusters indicated increased communication within their own clusters for the five specific activities listed as a result of the Institute (M), and six of the twelve clusters in "other activities" (Activity VI) as well; (2) participants of nine clusters communicated with participants of at least ten clusters other than their own;¹³ (3) participants in all clusters communicated with members of at least four other clusters; and (4) respondents in all clusters (except 11,

¹²Numbers indicated by respondents for "prior to" and "as a result of" the Summer Institute were used to obtain measures of increased (or new) communication within the respondent's cluster and with other clusters for the listed activities. Also, entries in Figure 3 may reflect the responses of one or more survey respondents. Figure 3 is included to illustrate patterns of interaction rather than numbers of responses.

¹³A sample letter from a cluster participant relating to increased inter-cluster communication appears in Appendix D.

which has entries in almost all cells of Figure 3) seem to have communicated with participants from other clusters about some activities more than others, possibly reflecting interests and needs relevant more to some clusters than to others.

Question 19-21: In your opinion, which General Session (19), Concurrent Session related to your area of specialization (20) and Concurrent Session related to module areas (21) was the most interesting?

A random sample of surveys representing all position categories was drawn from 11 of the 13 clusters¹⁴ in order to determine respondents' preferences for General Sessions (Question 19), Concurrent Sessions relating to area of specialization (Question 20) and Concurrent Sessions relating to module areas (Question 21). Almost all scheduled sessions were mentioned for each question. One general session, however, was cited as most interesting more frequently than any other, "The Dissertation".

Question 22: Were facilities for the following activities adequate?

General Sessions (Table 29)
 Concurrent Sessions (Table 30)
 Coffee Breaks (Table 31)
 Cocktails (Table 32)
 Monday, Friday Evening Banquets (Table 33)

All percentages reported for all sections of question

¹⁴Clusters 1 and 10 did not have respondents in each position category.

Figure 3

Inter-Cluster Communication (Data from Question 14)

KEY: R = As a result of Summer Institute

M = Prior to Summer Institute, but increase as a result of Summer Institute

I = To get professional assistance for problem in job.

II = To get assistance on practicum or work in study area.

III = To plan a national participant organization.

IV = To plan an activity with another cluster.

V = To maintain a personal friendship.

VI = Other (Social, maintain written correspondence, general sharing of educ. ideas, preliminary thesis work)

CODE #	CLUSTER NAME	CODE #	CLUSTER NAME
1	Broward, Fla.	8	New Haven, Conn.
2	Chicago, Ill.	9	Orlando, Fla.
3	Hampton, Va.	10	Pensacola, Fla.
4	Hillsborough, Fla.	11	Sacramento, Calif.
5	Jacksonville, Fla.	12	St. Petersburg, Fla.
6	Long Island, N.Y.	13	San Francisco, Calif.
7	Miami-Dade, Fla.		

Figure 3

Inter-Cluster Communication (Data from Question 14)

CLUSTER	Activity	CLUSTER												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	I II III IV V VI													
2	I II III IV V VI													
3	I II III IV V VI													
4	I II III IV V VI													
5	I II III IV V VI													

Figure 3 continued

CLUSTER	Activity	CLUSTER										
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
11	I	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
	II	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
	III	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
	IV	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
	V	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
	VI	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
12	I	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
	II	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
	III	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
	IV	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
	V	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
	VI	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
13	I	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
	II	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
	III	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
	IV	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
	V	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
	VI	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R

22 are obtained from Tables 29-33, responses of total population.¹⁵ Figure 4 presents a summary of Tables 29-33, adequacy of facilities for general sessions, concurrent sessions, coffee breaks, cocktails and banquets.

Figure 4
Adequacy of Facilities

Activity	Response	
	Yes	No
General Sessions	91%	9%
Concurrent Sessions	90%	10%
Coffee Breaks	79%	21%
Cocktails	95%	5%
Banquets	97%	3%

Figure 4 shows that facilities for coffee breaks were considered adequate by only 79% of the respondents, whereas facilities for all other activities were considered adequate by at least 90%. Facilities for cocktails and banquets obtained the highest ratings (95%, 97%).

Question 23: How many miles did you travel in one direction to attend the Summer Institute?

Question 24: By what means did you travel to the Summer Institute? (Tables 34A,34B)

A tally of responses to question 23, the number of miles

¹⁵Tables 29-33 are in Appendix C. Each table precedes Table A (crossbroken by response and present position) and Table B (crossbroken by response and cluster membership) for that section of Question 22. For example, Table 29 precedes Tables 29A and 29B.

traveled in one direction to reach the Summer Institute, indicates a range of "one block" to "3000+" miles.

More respondents used automobiles (Tables 34A, 34B; 57%) than used airline transportation (40%). Only 3% used other means of transportation. Most of those who used other means than airplane and auto indicated that they used campers.¹⁶

As might be expected, there is a very strong relationship between the means of transportation used to reach the Institute and the cluster membership ($\lambda=72\%$; Table 34B). All Broward, Hillsborough, and Pensacola respondents, and most respondents from other Florida clusters (Table 34B: Jacksonville, 96%; Orlando, 96%; St. Petersburg 94%; Miami-Dade, 93%) used automobiles to reach the Institute. The two Miami-Dade cluster members who indicated they traveled by airplane may have had to travel to the Institute from a temporary location away from home. Respondents of only two clusters, Hampton and New Haven, indicated means of travel other than airplane or automobile.

¹⁶Obtained from an examination of the surveys.

Question 25: In your opinion is there any activity or session that should have been, but was not included in the Summer Institute? (Tables 35A,35B)

Forty-one percent of all respondents indicated that there was an activity or session that should have been, but was not included in the Summer Institute (Tables 35A,35B). When present position is considered (Table 35A), 77% of respondents in Engineering Technology (compared with 33% to 43% in other position categories) indicated this response. The lambda obtained for improving the prediction of the response from present position is 9%, although chi-square is not significant ($P=.02$).

It has previously been reported that a higher percentage of respondents in Engineering Technology than in other position categories felt that their most pressing questions about general program structure, seminars with national lecturers and practicums were not answered during the Summer Institute (see Question 15, Tables 19A,20A,21A).

Activities cited by respondents which should have been, but were not included in the Summer Institute are (the order of the items listed below does not indicate a ranking of items):

1. Sharing of completed practicums arranged by module areas (perhaps include only those of high quality);
2. Sharing by program participants of unusual, exciting activities within their own schools;
3. More small group sessions in a workshop format;

4. Distribution of illustrative materials during sessions (or perhaps prior to sessions);
5. Independent study sessions on specific problem areas (special interest groups);
6. Small group rap sessions to express feelings and ask questions;
7. Scheduled social event at Nova University;
8. Presence at Institute of all national lecturers;
9. Sessions related to Educational Technology;
10. Evening "bull sessions" with national lecturers; and
11. Meeting of cluster coordinators.

Question 26: In your opinion, is there any area of expertise that should have been, but was not represented by the session speakers and discussants? (Tables 36A, 36B)

About 22% of all respondents felt that there was an area of expertise that should have been, but was not represented by session speakers and discussants (Tables 36A, 36B). Table 36A shows that a significant ($P=.01$), although not very strong ($\lambda=9\%$) relationship is obtained between response and present position. More Engineering Technology respondents (64%) than persons in other position categories (18% to 30%) indicated this response. This finding is consistent with data obtained in questions 15 and 25 which also show that Engineering Technology persons felt, more than persons in other position categories, that the Institute

program did not adequately meet their specific needs as represented in each of the questions.

The areas of expertise which survey respondents indicated should have been but were not included in the Summer Institute are (the order of the items listed below does not indicate a ranking of items):

1. State and Federal guidelines for and sources of funding;
2. State and Federal legislators (and legislation) who have an impact on funding programs in the community colleges (perhaps have legislators represented at the 1973-1974 Institute);
3. Pupil job placement; and
4. Educational Technology (e.g., management systems).

Question 27: In your opinion, did the Summer Institute "knit together" the many components of the Ed.D. Program? (Tables 37A,37B)

Ninety-five percent of all survey respondents indicated that, in their opinion, the Summer Institute knit together the many program components (Tables 37A,37B). Consistent with findings in questions 15, 25 and 26 more Engineering Technology persons than persons in other position categories did not feel that the Institute "knit it all together" (Table 37A: 29% Engineering Technology respondents; 2% to 6% respondents in other position categories).

Question 28: Was your single most important objective accomplished during the Summer Institute? (Tables 38A,37B)

Ninety-five percent of the survey respondents indicated that their single, most important objective was accomplished during the Summer Institute (Tables 38A,38B). Interestingly, there are no significant differences when either present position or cluster membership are considered. At least 91% of persons in each position category (Table 38A) and at least 37% of persons in each cluster category (Table 38B) felt that their most important objective was met.

The single, most important objective which respondents cited in the surveys consistently related to obtaining an overall understanding of the total Ed.D. program.

IV. SUMMARY

Most participants (78%; Table 1A,1B) stayed at the Diplomat Hotel during the Summer Institute, and, as expected there is a strong relationship between this factor and cluster membership (Table 1B). Those who stayed at the Diplomat felt that the facilities and food were adequate, but many indicated that the food was too expensive. Further, 35% of the respondents brought their spouses with them (Tables 6A,6B) and 26% brought their children (Tables 7A,7B). Those who brought families with them to the Institute are primarily from clusters located in the Northeastern states and Florida. Although most persons stayed in Florida only for the Summer Institute (71%; Tables 12A,12B), many indicated that they remained at least one additional day, possibly to qualify for airline excursion rates.

Respondents in two clusters indicated that their institutions are paying a portion of the cost of the Institute, while 98% of the respondents are paying the total cost themselves (Tables 8A,8B). Only 6% of the respondents borrowed money from a federally insured loan to help defray costs (Tables 10A,10B).

Facilities for most scheduled activities were considered quite adequate (90%-97%) with facilities for coffee breaks considered adequate by only 74% (Figure 4).

More respondents used automobiles (57%; Tables 34A, 34B) than used airline transportation (40%). Further, respondents indicated a range of "1 block" to "3000+" miles traveled in one direction to reach the Summer Institute.

Ninety-six percent of the respondents felt that one week was long enough for the Institute (Tables 11A, 11B). Some respondents (among the remaining 4%) noted that 3-4 days would have been sufficient. Further, early August is preferred for the Institute by more than 60% of the respondents.

Some respondents would have liked more free time during the Institute. When present position is considered 60-74% felt they had enough free time (Table 14A). However, when clusters are considered, 44%-100% felt they had enough free time (Table 14B).

Most respondents (89%; Tables 15A, 15B) rated the Summer Institute as either excellent or good. Also, 94% (Tables 17A, 17B) would want to attend a Summer Institute again next year. Seventy-two percent would not want to attend a regional Institute rather than a national Institute (Tables 16A, 16B).

Respondents most pressing questions about the three program areas specified were, for the most part, answered during the Institute (89%-95%; Tables 19A-21B), although a lower percentage of persons in Educational Technology than in other position categories felt that their questions

had been answered. Participants' questions not answered adequately related primarily to: the dissertation; the size of lecture groups, selection and scheduling of national lecturers; and requirements for practicums during the third year.

Overall, most participants (58%; Tables 22A,22B) enjoyed general and concurrent sessions equally well.

Participants generally had more opportunity to interact with session speakers and lecturers during concurrent sessions (93%; Tables 24A,24B) and outside scheduled sessions (93%; Tables 25A,25B) than during General Sessions (56%; Tables 23A,23B). Although no strong relationships were obtained, a higher percentage of persons in Administration than in other position categories indicated opportunities for interaction in all three session categories, and a lower percentage of persons in Educational Technology than in other position categories indicated this opportunity during general and concurrent sessions.

Respondents indicated that they had more opportunity for interaction with participants from other clusters outside scheduled sessions (98%; Tables 28A,28B) than during concurrent (87%; Tables 27A,27B) or general sessions (74%; Tables 26A,26B). Further, there seems to have been increased communication among cluster members within a particular cluster as well as between members of different clusters as a result of the Summer Institute (Figure 3).

Although almost all scheduled sessions were mentioned

by respondents as most interesting, one general session, "The Dissertation", was cited most frequently.

Many respondents (41%; Tables 35A,35B) indicated that there was an activity or session that should have been, but was not included in the Summer Institute. A higher percentage (77%) of participants in Educational Technology than in other position categories indicated this response. Activities or sessions which respondents felt should have been, but were not included related primarily to: (1) Sharing of participant-developed materials (e.g., Practicums) and ideas and happenings within institutions; and (2) small group sessions (e.g., special interest groups, "bull" sessions).

Some participants (22%; Tables 36A,36B) felt that there was an area of expertise that should have been, but was not represented by session speakers and discussants. A higher percentage of respondents in Educational Technology (64%) than in other position categories (18% to 30%) indicated this response. The areas of expertise that respondents noted should have been, but were not included related to: (1) Obtaining funding; (2) pupil job placement; and (3) educational technology.

Ninety-five percent of all respondents indicated that the Institute "knit it all together" for them (Tables 37A, 37B), although more persons in Educational Technology (29%) than in other position categories (2% to 6%)

indicated that, for them, the Institute did not knit together the many program components.

Also, 95% of the respondents felt that their single, most important objective was accomplished during the Summer Institute (Tables 38A,38B). The single, most important objective cited by respondents consistently related to obtaining an overall understanding of the Ed.D. program.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The theme of the first Summer Institute of the Ed.D. Program for Community College Faculty was "Knitting It All Together." This objective was accomplished for 95% of the survey respondents. Several Summer Institute Survey questions help to identify the process by which the many program components may have been integrated into a viable entity, in particular, those questions relating to opportunity for communication and the degree to which participants' questions were answered and objectives met.

The percentages obtained for opportunity to interact in both communication questions (17 and 18) can be considered quite high. That 56% of the respondents felt that they had an opportunity to interact with speakers and lecturers during general sessions might be considered an indication that participants perceived the Institute environment to be open and supportive. As might be expected, the lowest percentages were obtained for opportunity for communication with speakers and lecturers and other participants during general sessions and the highest outside scheduled sessions. Almost all respondents indicated that they were able to interact with speakers and lecturers (93%) and other participants (98%) outside scheduled sessions.

Further, the Institute seems to have increased communication within a cluster as well as among members of

different clusters. In this sense, the Institute may be viewed as a retreat, in which persons are in constant contact with one another, away from personal and possibly distracting influences, focusing continually on common problems and objectives and, perhaps most important, getting to know colleagues on a personal as well as professional basis.

That 94% of the respondents felt that they had enough free time during the Institute and 72% prefer a national rather than regional Institute provide additional indications of the process of interpersonal communication which seems to have evolved during the Institute despite the fact that meetings were scheduled from 8:30-5:30 daily.

In addition, participants formalized both inter-cluster communication and their role in providing program input. During the Summer Institute the participants organized a group to include representatives from each cluster to discuss common problems and concerns. As a result of this, each cluster will send a representative to the mid-year planning conference.

The second part of the integration or "knitting it all together" process is documented by the number of respondents who felt that their major questions were answered in each of the specified areas (89% to 95%). Those areas which still require clarification, the dissertation and

related to the dissertation, practicum requirements during the third year, are, interestingly, the focus of a special meeting of the Nova staff and national lecturers in the Fall of 1973.

Further, despite the fact that 41% of the respondents felt that there were activities and sessions that should have been, but were not included and 22% felt that certain areas of expertise were not represented in the Institute, most respondents' (95%) single, most important objective was met during the Institute. The single, most important objective cited by respondents most frequently, gaining an understanding of the total program, may be interpreted as a restatement of "knitting it all together". In other words, the entire theme of this first Institute seems to have met a general need to have anxieties reduced and ambiguities clarified.

Respondent satisfaction with the Institute is further documented by the number of respondents who rated the Institute excellent or good (87%), and the number who would want to return to an Institute next summer (94%). Since 98% of the respondents paid the total cost of the Institute themselves, and 94% would want to return next year, it would seem that participants derived many benefits from the Institute. Some of these benefits, both program and personal, have already been discussed.

It might be useful, prior to the 1974 Institute, to

survey program participants as to precisely what factors account for their intent to return next year, since they are required to attend only two of the three Institutes during their three years in the program. At the same time, it might be possible to assess program participants' needs and expectations for the 1974 Institute. Surveying participants' needs and expectations for the 1974 Institute should be a valuable planning tool, since about half of the participants will have already attended one Institute and about half will have been in the program for one year or less by next summer.

Although the Institute met most respondents' objectives, Educational Technology persons consistently indicated that they felt theirs were not adequately met. Next year's Institute should include more activities specifically designed to meet the needs and interests of those in Educational Technology.

Two areas of concern should be considered in relation to all program participants: (1) Activities, sessions and areas of expertise which respondents indicated should have been included in this year's Institute should be considered for inclusion in the 1974 Institute; and (2) concerns which respondents still had at the conclusion of the Institute should be alleviated during this current year. One category of suggested activities or sessions that participants felt should have been included seems particularly relevant to both areas of concern; more unstructured

small group activity based on special interests, problems and needs in which participants might explore, share and possibly plan and implement during the Institute certain desired activities.

The national character of the program was highlighted very forcefully by participants indicating that they traveled "one block" to "3000+" miles in one direction to reach the Summer Institute. This finding, perhaps more than any other data contained in this report, emphasizes the vast geographic area serviced by the Ed.D. Program for Community College Faculty.

APPENDIX A :
NEEDS ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

NOVA UNIVERSITY NATIONAL Ed.D. PROGRAM FOR
COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY

Dear Participant:

We would like to make this first Summer Institute exciting, meaningful, and helpful to you. Therefore, we would greatly appreciate your cooperation in completing the following short form and returning it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope by Monday, July 30, 1973.

Name _____

Cluster _____

Teaching Faculty
Counselor & Student Personnel
Services Staff
Administrator

1. Please list your most pressing questions about the Ed.D. Program for each of the following areas.

a. General Program Structure:

- (1) _____
(2) _____
(3) _____
(4) _____
(5) _____

b. Seminars with National Lecturers:

- (1) _____
(2) _____
(3) _____
(4) _____
(5) _____

c. Practicums:

- (1) _____
(2) _____
(3) _____

(4) _____

(5) _____

2. What is the single, most important objective of the Summer Institute
for you? _____

3. List any other expectations you have for the Summer Institute..

(a) _____

(b) _____

(c) _____

(d) _____

(e) _____

APPENDIX B:
SUMMER INSTITUTE SURVEY

NOVA UNIVERSITY NATIONAL Ed.D. PROGRAM FOR
COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY

SUMMER INSTITUTE SURVEY

Name _____

Cluster _____

Present Position: ☐ Administration
☐ Behavioral Science
☐ Curriculum and Instruction
☐ Engineering Technology

1. Did you room at the Diplomat during the Summer Institute? ☐ Yes ☐ No

a. If Yes:

Were the facilities adequate? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Was the food to your liking? ☐ Yes ☐ No

b. If No:

Did you stay with friends or relatives? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Did you stay at a different hotel? ☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Did your spouse come with you to the Summer Institute? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If you do not have children, please skip to question 4.

3. Did any of your children come with you to the Summer Institute? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, how many? _____

4. Who is paying for your participation in the Summer Institute?

- ☐ I am paying the total cost myself.
☐ I am paying a portion of the cost and my school is paying a portion.
☐ My school is paying the total cost.

If your school is paying the total cost of your participation in the Summer Institute, please skip to question 6.

5. How much do you estimate that the Summer Institute has cost you?
Please don't include expenses for spouse or children).

- ☐ less than \$50
☐ \$50 - \$100
☐ \$101 - \$200
☐ \$201 - \$300
☐ \$301 - \$400
☐ \$400 - \$500
☐ more than \$500

6. Did you borrow money from a federally insured loan to help pay for your costs for the Summer Institute? ☐ Yes ☐ No
-

7. In your opinion, was one week long enough for the Summer Institute? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If No, how long should it have been? ☐ 2 weeks
☐ 3 weeks
☐ other: weeks

If you live in South Florida, please skip to question 9.

8. How long did you (or will you) stay in South Florida?

☐ Just for the Summer Institute
☐ Additional days--specify number: days

9. In your opinion, when is the best time to schedule the next Summer Institute?

☐ Early June
☐ Mid June
☐ Late June
☐ Early July
☐ Mid July
☐ Late July
☐ Early August
☐ Mid August
☐ Late August

10. Did you have enough free time during the Summer Institute? ☐ Yes ☐ No

11. How would you rate the Summer Institute? ☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor

12. Would you prefer to attend a regional Summer Institute (for example, in California, New York or Ft. Lauderdale) rather than a national institute? ☐ Yes ☐ No

13. Would you want to attend a Summer Institute again next year? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Clusters are identified by the following code numbers in question 14. The table to be completed for question 14 is on page 4.

CODE #	CLUSTER NAME	CODE #	CLUSTER NAME
1	Broward, Fla.	8	New Haven, Conn.
2	Chicago, Ill.	9	Orlando, Fla.
3	Hampton, Va.	10	Pensacola, Fla.
4	Hillsborough, Fla.	11	Sacramento, Calif.
5	Jacksonville, Fla.	12	St. Petersburg, Fla.
6	Long Island, N.Y.	13	San Francisco, Calif.
7	Miami-Dade, Fla.		

14. For each cluster identified (by cluster code number) in the following table (page 4), please indicate:

- the number of participants with whom you communicated for each activity listed in columns I-VI prior to the Summer Institute, and
- the number of participants with whom you intend to communicate for each activity listed in columns I-VI as a result of the Summer Institute

15. Were your most pressing questions about each of the following areas answered during the Summer Institute?

General Program Structure ☐ Yes ☐ No

If No, please list any questions you still have _____

Seminars with National Lecturers ☐ Yes ☐ No

If No, please list any questions you still have _____

Practicums ☐ Yes ☐ No

If No, please list any questions you still have _____

Table to be used for question 14

- 4 -

ACTIVITY CLUSTER CODE NUMBER	I To get professional assistance for problem in job		II To get assistance on practicum or work in study area		III To plan a national participant organization		IV To plan an activity with another cluster		V To maintain a personal friendship		VI Other: (Please specify)	
	a Prior to S.I.	b As a result of S.I.	a Prior to S.I.	b As a result of S.I.	a Prior to S.I.	b As a result of S.I.	a Prior to S.I.	b As a result of S.I.	a Prior to S.I.	b As a result of S.I.	a Prior to S.I.	b As a result of S.I.
1												
2												
3												
4												
5												
6												
7												
8												
9												
10												
11												
12												
13												

16. Overall, which sessions did you enjoy most?

- ☐ General Sessions
☐ Concurrent Sessions
☐ Both General and Concurrent Sessions equally well

17. Did you personally have an opportunity to speak with (or ask questions of) national lecturers and session speakers:

- Yes No
☐ ☐ During General Sessions
☐ ☐ During Concurrent Sessions
☐ ☐ Outside Scheduled Sessions

18. Did you personally have an opportunity to speak with (or ask questions of) participants from other clusters:

- Yes No
☐ ☐ During General Sessions
☐ ☐ During Concurrent Sessions
☐ ☐ Outside Scheduled Sessions

19. In your opinion, which General Session was the most interesting?

Session Title: _____

20. In your opinion, which Concurrent Session related to your area of specialization was the most interesting?

Session Title: _____

21. In your opinion, which Concurrent Session related to module areas was the most interesting?

Session Title _____

22. Were facilities for the following activities adequate?

- Yes No
☐ ☐ General Sessions
☐ ☐ Concurrent Sessions
☐ ☐ Coffee Breaks
☐ ☐ Cocktails
☐ ☐ Monday, Friday Evening Banquets

23. How many miles did you travel to attend the Summer Institute?

_____ miles in one direction

24. By what means did you travel to the Summer Institute?

- ☐ by airplane
☐ by automobile
☐ other (please specify) _____

25. In your opinion is there any activity or session that should have been, but was not included in the Summer Institute? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, please specify _____

26. In your opinion, is there any area of expertise that should have been, but was not represented by the session speakers and discussants?
☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, please specify _____

27. In your opinion, did the Summer Institute "knit together" the many components of the Ed.D. Program? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If No, please explain _____

28. What was the single, most important objective of the Summer Institute for you when you began on Monday? _____

29. Was this objective accomplished during the Summer Institute? ☐ Yes ☐ No

General Comments:

APPENDIX C:
TABLES

TABLE 1A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 1. DID YOU RESPOND AT THE DIPLOMAT DURING THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

1	CELL FREQ	68	16	84
	% ROW	81.0	19.0	
	% COL	40.5	35.6	
	% TABLE	31.9	7.5	39.4

2	CELL FREQ	33	9	42
	% ROW	78.6	21.4	
	% COL	19.6	20.0	
	% TABLE	15.5	4.2	19.7

3	CELL FREQ	59	13	72
	% ROW	81.9	18.1	
	% COL	35.1	28.9	
	% TABLE	27.7	6.1	33.8

4	CELL FREQ	8	7	15
	% ROW	53.3	46.7	
	% COL	4.8	15.6	
	% TABLE	3.8	3.3	7.0

	TOTAL COL FREQ	168	45	213
	% TABLE	78.87	21.13	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 28 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 11.62

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 6.4995 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.0897

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.00000

CRITERION

PREDICTOR

LAMBDA

ROW

COLUMN

0.00000

COLUMN

ROW

0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BRØWARD; 2=CHICAGØ; 3=HAMPTØN; 4=HILLSBØRØUGH; 5=JACKSØNVILLE;
 6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ØRLANDØ; 10=PENSACØLA;
 11=SACRAMENTØ; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCØ.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 1. DID YØU RØØM AT THE DIPLOMAT DURING THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
 1 = YES; 2 = NØ.

		TOTALS	
		1	2

	CELL FREQ	0	2
1	% RØW	0.0	100.0
	% CØL	0.0	4.0
	% TABLE	0.0	0.9

	CELL FREQ	22	0
2	% RØW	100.0	0.0
	% CØL	12.6	0.0
	% TABLE	9.8	0.0

	CELL FREQ	13	2
3	% RØW	86.7	13.3
	% CØL	7.5	4.0
	% TABLE	5.8	0.9

	CELL FREQ	15	4
4	% RØW	78.9	21.1
	% CØL	8.6	8.0
	% TABLE	6.7	1.8

	CELL FREQ	21	5
5	% RØW	80.8	19.2
	% CØL	12.1	10.0
	% TABLE	9.4	2.2

	CELL FREQ	12	1
6	% RØW	92.3	7.7
	% CØL	6.9	2.0
	% TABLE	5.4	0.4

	CELL FREQ	5	21
7	% RØW	19.2	80.8
	% CØL	2.9	42.0
	% TABLE	2.2	9.4

TABLE 1B

8	CELL FREQ	* 13	* 4	* 17	*
	% ROW	* 76.5	* 23.5	*	
	% COL	* 7.5	* 8.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 5.8	* 1.8	* 7.6	*

9	CELL FREQ	* 18	* 3	* 21	*
	% ROW	* 85.7	* 14.3	*	
	% COL	* 10.3	* 6.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 8.0	* 1.3	* 9.4	*

10	CELL FREQ	* 2	* 2	* 4	*
	% ROW	* 50.0	* 50.0	*	
	% COL	* 1.1	* 4.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 0.9	* 0.9	* 1.8	*

11	CELL FREQ	* 16	* 1	* 17	*
	% ROW	* 94.1	* 5.9	*	
	% COL	* 9.2	* 2.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 7.1	* 0.4	* 7.6	*

12	CELL FREQ	* 15	* 3	* 18	*
	% ROW	* 83.3	* 16.7	*	
	% COL	* 8.6	* 6.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 6.7	* 1.3	* 8.0	*

13	CELL FREQ	* 22	* 2	* 24	*
	% ROW	* 91.7	* 8.3	*	
	% COL	* 12.6	* 4.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 9.8	* 0.9	* 10.7	*

	TL COL FREQ	174	50	224	
	% TABLE	77.68	22.32		

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 17 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 7.05

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 75.2252 DF = 12 P = 0.0000

	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.14113
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.08586
COLUMN	ROW	0.36000

TABLE 2A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 1A(1), WERE THE FACILITIES ADEQUATE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	68	2	70
% ROW	97.1	2.9	*
% COL	40.7	20.0	*
% TABLE	38.4	1.1	39.5
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	37	3	40
% ROW	92.5	7.5	*
% COL	22.2	30.0	*
% TABLE	20.9	1.7	22.6
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	54	5	59
% ROW	91.5	8.5	*
% COL	32.3	50.0	*
% TABLE	30.5	2.6	33.3
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	8	0	8
% ROW	100.0	0.0	*
% COL	4.8	0.0	*
% TABLE	4.5	0.0	4.5
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	167	10	177
% TABLE	94.35	5.65	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 64 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 26.56

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 2.6433 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.4500

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.02564
ROW	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
COLUMN	COLUMN	0.02804
ROW	ROW	0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 1A(1). WERE THE FACILITIES ADEQUATE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		TOTALS	
		1	2
1	CELL FREQ	0	0
	% ROW	0.0	0.0
	% COL	0.0	0.0
	% TABLE	0.0	0.0
2	CELL FREQ	21	4
	% ROW	84.0	16.0
	% COL	12.2	33.3
	% TABLE	11.4	2.2
3	CELL FREQ	12	1
	% ROW	92.3	7.7
	% COL	7.0	8.3
	% TABLE	6.5	0.5
4	CELL FREQ	18	0
	% ROW	100.0	0.0
	% COL	10.5	0.0
	% TABLE	9.8	0.0
	CELL FREQ	21	0
	% ROW	100.0	0.0
	% COL	12.2	0.0
	% TABLE	11.4	0.0
	CELL FREQ	11	2
	% ROW	84.6	15.4
	% COL	6.4	16.7
	% TABLE	6.0	1.1
	CELL FREQ	5	0
	% ROW	100.0	0.0
	% COL	2.9	0.0
	% TABLE	2.7	0.0

TABLE 2B

TABLE 2B cont.

9	CELL FREQ	12	*	12	*	2	*	14	*
	% ROW	85.7	*	14.3	*		*		
	% COL	7.0	*	16.7	*		*		
	% TABLE	6.5	*	1.1	*		*	7.6	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
	CELL FREQ	20	*	0	*	20	*		
	% ROW	100.0	*	0.0	*		*		
	% COL	11.6	*	0.0	*		*		
	% TABLE	10.9	*	0.0	*		*	10.9	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
	CELL FREQ	1	*	1	*	2	*		
10	% ROW	50.0	*	50.0	*		*		
	% COL	0.6	*	8.3	*		*		
	% TABLE	0.5	*	0.5	*		*	1.1	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
11	CELL FREQ	14	*	2	*	16	*		
	% ROW	87.5	*	12.5	*		*		
	% COL	8.1	*	16.7	*		*		
	% TABLE	7.6	*	1.1	*		*	8.7	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
12	CELL FREQ	15	*	0	*	15	*		
	% ROW	100.0	*	0.0	*		*		
	% COL	8.7	*	0.0	*		*		
	% TABLE	8.2	*	0.0	*		*	8.2	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
13	CELL FREQ	22	*	0	*	22	*		
	% ROW	100.0	*	0.0	*		*		
	% COL	12.8	*	0.0	*		*		
	% TABLE	12.0	*	0.0	*		*	12.0	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
	TL COL FREQ	172		12		184			
	% TABLE	93.48		6.52					

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 57 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 23.65

TABLE 3A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION, 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION, 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 1A(2) WAS THE FORD TO YOUR LIKING.
1 = YES, 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	43	18	61
% ROW	70.5	29.5	*
% COL	47.8	30.0	*
% TABLE	28.7	12.0	40.7
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	15	17	32
% ROW	46.5	53.1	*
% COL	16.7	28.3	*
% TABLE	10.0	11.3	21.3
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	29	23	52
% ROW	55.8	44.2	*
% COL	32.2	38.3	*
% TABLE	19.3	15.3	34.7
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	3	2	5
% ROW	60.0	40.0	*
% COL	3.3	3.3	*
% TABLE	2.0	1.3	3.3
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	90	60	150
% TABLE	60.00	40.00	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 91 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 37.76

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 5.4825 , DF = 3 , P = 0.1397

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.04698
ROW	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
COLUMN	COLUMN	0.05618
ROW	ROW	0.03333

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 1A(2) WAS THE FOOD TO YOUR LIKING.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

TOTALS				
	1	2		
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
1 CELL FREQ	* 0	* 0	* 0	*
% ROW	* 0.0	* 0.0	*	*
% COL	* 0.0	* 0.0	*	*
% TABLE	* 0.0	* 0.0	* 0.0	*
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
2 CELL FREQ	* 5	* 16	* 21	*
% ROW	* 23.8	* 76.2	*	*
% COL	* 5.3	* 26.2	*	*
% TABLE	* 3.2	* 10.3	* 13.5	*
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
3 CELL FREQ	* 9	* 3	* 12	*
% ROW	* 75.0	* 25.0	*	*
% COL	* 9.6	* 4.9	*	*
% TABLE	* 5.8	* 1.9	* 7.7	*
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
4 CELL FREQ	* 16	* 1	* 17	*
% ROW	* 94.1	* 5.9	*	*
% COL	* 17.0	* 1.6	*	*
% TABLE	* 10.3	* 0.6	* 11.0	*
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
5 CELL FREQ	* 16	* 2	* 18	*
% ROW	* 88.9	* 11.1	*	*
% COL	* 17.0	* 3.3	*	*
% TABLE	* 10.3	* 1.3	* 11.6	*
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
6 CELL FREQ	* 3	* 5	* 8	*
% ROW	* 37.5	* 62.5	*	*
% COL	* 3.2	* 8.2	*	*
% TABLE	* 1.9	* 3.2	* 5.2	*
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
7 CELL FREQ	* 5	* 1	* 6	*
% ROW	* 83.3	* 16.7	*	*
% COL	* 5.3	* 1.6	*	*
% TABLE	* 3.2	* 0.6	* 3.9	*
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****

TABLE 3B

TABLE 3B cont.

8	CELL FREQ	*	6	*	4	*	10	*
	% ROW	*	60.0	*	40.0	*		
	% COL	*	6.4	*	6.6	*		
	% TABLE	*	3.9	*	2.6	*	6.5	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
9	CELL FREQ	*	12	*	4	*	16	*
	% ROW	*	75.0	*	25.0	*		
	% COL	*	12.8	*	6.6	*		
	% TABLE	*	7.7	*	2.6	*	10.3	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
10	CELL FREQ	*	2	*	0	*	2	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		
	% COL	*	2.1	*	0.0	*		
	% TABLE	*	1.3	*	0.0	*	1.3	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
11	CELL FREQ	*	5	*	10	*	15	*
	% ROW	*	33.3	*	66.7	*		
	% COL	*	5.3	*	16.4	*		
	% TABLE	*	3.2	*	6.5	*	9.7	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
12	CELL FREQ	*	7	*	4	*	11	*
	% ROW	*	63.6	*	36.4	*		
	% COL	*	7.4	*	6.6	*		
	% TABLE	*	4.5	*	2.6	*	7.1	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
13	CELL FREQ	*	8	*	11	*	19	*
	% ROW	*	42.1	*	57.9	*		
	% COL	*	8.5	*	18.0	*		
	% TABLE	*	5.2	*	7.1	*	12.3	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
	TL COL FREQ		94		61		155	
	% TABLE		60.65		39.35			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 86 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 35.68

TABLE 4A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION, 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE,
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION, 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 1B(1) DID YOU STAY WITH FRIENDS OR RELATIVES.
1 = YES, 2 = NO

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	6	13	19
% ROW	31.6	68.4	*
% COL	35.3	38.2	*
% TABLE	11.8	25.5	37.3
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	4	7	11
% ROW	36.4	63.6	*
% COL	23.5	20.6	*
% TABLE	7.8	13.7	21.6
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	7	11	18
% ROW	38.9	61.1	*
% COL	41.2	32.4	*
% TABLE	13.7	21.6	35.3
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	0	3	3
% ROW	0.0	100.0	*
% COL	0.0	8.8	*
% TABLE	0.0	5.9	5.9
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	17	34	51
% TABLE	33.33	66.67	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 190 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 78.84

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 1.8218 / DF = 3 / P = 0.6102

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.02041

CRITERION

PREDICTOR

LAMBDA

ROW

COLUMN

0.03125

COLUMN

ROW

0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 1B(1) DID YOU STAY WITH FRIENDS OR RELATIVES.
1 = YES; 2 = NO

		1	2	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	0	1	1
1	% ROW	0.0	100.0	
	% COL	0.0	2.7	
	% TABLE	0.0	1.9	1.9

	CELL FREQ	1	5	6
2	% ROW	16.7	83.3	
	% COL	5.9	13.5	
	% TABLE	1.9	9.3	11.1

	CELL FREQ	0	2	2
3	% ROW	0.0	100.0	
	% COL	0.0	5.4	
	% TABLE	0.0	3.7	3.7

	CELL FREQ	2	1	3
4	% ROW	66.7	33.3	
	% COL	11.8	2.7	
	% TABLE	3.7	1.9	5.6

	CELL FREQ	2	3	5
5	% ROW	40.0	60.0	
	% COL	11.8	8.1	
	% TABLE	3.7	5.6	9.3

	CELL FREQ	0	0	0
6	% ROW	0.0	0.0	
	% COL	0.0	0.0	
	% TABLE	0.0	0.0	0.0

	CELL FREQ	2	14	16
7	% ROW	12.5	87.5	
	% COL	11.8	37.8	
	% TABLE	3.7	25.9	29.6

TABLE 4B

TABLE 4B cont.

8	CELL FREQ	*	2	*	2	*	4	*
	% ROW	*	50.0	*	50.0	*		
	% COL	*	11.8	*	5.4	*		
	% TABLE	*	3.7	*	3.7	*	7.4	*
9	CELL FREQ	*	2	*	1	*	3	*
	% ROW	*	66.7	*	33.3	*		
	% COL	*	11.8	*	2.7	*		
	% TABLE	*	3.7	*	1.9	*	5.6	*
10	CELL FREQ	*	1	*	2	*	3	*
	% ROW	*	33.3	*	66.7	*		
	% COL	*	5.9	*	5.4	*		
	% TABLE	*	1.9	*	3.7	*	5.6	*
11	CELL FREQ	*	2	*	1	*	3	*
	% ROW	*	66.7	*	33.3	*		
	% COL	*	11.8	*	2.7	*		
	% TABLE	*	3.7	*	1.9	*	5.6	*
12	CELL FREQ	*	2	*	2	*	4	*
	% ROW	*	50.0	*	50.0	*		
	% COL	*	11.8	*	5.4	*		
	% TABLE	*	3.7	*	3.7	*	7.4	*
13	CELL FREQ	*	1	*	3	*	4	*
	% ROW	*	25.0	*	75.0	*		
	% COL	*	5.9	*	8.1	*		
	% TABLE	*	1.9	*	5.6	*	7.4	*
	TL COL FREQ		17		37		54	
	% TABLE		31.48		68.52			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 187 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 77.59

TABLE 5A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION, 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE,
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION, 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 1B(2) DID YOU STAY AT A DIFFERENT HOTEL.
1 = YES, 2 = NO

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	3	10	13
% ROW	23.1	76.9	*
% COL	37.5	31.3	*
% TABLE	7.5	25.0	32.5
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	2	7	9
% ROW	22.2	77.8	*
% COL	25.0	21.9	22.5
% TABLE	5.0	17.5	*
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	1	13	14
% ROW	7.1	92.9	*
% COL	12.5	40.6	35.0
% TABLE	2.5	32.5	*
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	2	2	4
% ROW	50.0	50.0	*
% COL	25.0	6.3	10.0
% TABLE	5.0	5.0	*
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	8	32	40
% TABLE	20.00	80.00	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 201 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 83.40

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 3.8011 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.2838

CRITERION PREDICTOR LAMBDA
ROW COLUMN
COLUMN ROW
SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.05882
LAMBDA
0.07592
0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 1B(2) DID YOU STAY AT A DIFFERENT HOTEL.
1 = YES; 2 = NO

		1	2	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	0	1	1
1	% ROW	0.0	100.0	
	% COL	0.0	2.9	
	% TABLE	0.0	2.3	2.3

	CELL FREQ	0	6	6
2	% ROW	0.0	100.0	
	% COL	0.0	17.1	
	% TABLE	0.0	14.0	14.0

	CELL FREQ	0	2	2
3	% ROW	0.0	100.0	
	% COL	0.0	5.7	
	% TABLE	0.0	4.7	4.7

	CELL FREQ	1	1	2
4	% ROW	50.0	50.0	
	% COL	12.5	2.9	
	% TABLE	2.3	2.3	4.7

	CELL FREQ	1	2	3
5	% ROW	33.3	66.7	
	% COL	12.5	5.7	
	% TABLE	2.3	4.7	7.0

	CELL FREQ	0	0	0
6	% ROW	0.0	0.0	
	% COL	0.0	0.0	
	% TABLE	0.0	0.0	0.0

	CELL FREQ	0	13	13
7	% ROW	0.0	100.0	
	% COL	0.0	37.1	
	% TABLE	0.0	30.2	30.2

TABLE 5B

TABLE 5B cont.

9	CELL FREQ	*	3	*	0	*	3	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		
	% COL	*	37.5	*	0.0	*		
	% TABLE	*	7.0	*	0.0	*	7.0	*

	CELL FREQ	*	2	*	2	*	4	*
	% ROW	*	50.0	*	50.0	*		
	% COL	*	25.0	*	5.7	*		
	% TABLE	*	4.7	*	4.7	*	9.3	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	0	*	2	*	2	*
	% ROW	*	0.0	*	100.0	*		
	% COL	*	0.0	*	5.7	*		
	% TABLE	*	0.0	*	4.7	*	4.7	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	0	*	1	*	1	*
	% ROW	*	0.0	*	100.0	*		
	% COL	*	0.0	*	2.9	*		
	% TABLE	*	0.0	*	2.3	*	2.3	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	1	*	3	*	4	*
	% ROW	*	25.0	*	75.0	*		
	% COL	*	12.5	*	8.6	*		
	% TABLE	*	2.3	*	7.0	*	9.3	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	0	*	2	*	2	*
	% ROW	*	0.0	*	100.0	*		
	% COL	*	0.0	*	5.7	*		
	% TABLE	*	0.0	*	4.7	*	4.7	*

	TL COL FREQ		8		35		43	
	% TABLE		18.60		81.40			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 198

PERCENT OF TOTAL: 82.16

TABLE 6A

ROWS REPRESENT:

PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 2. DID YOUR SPOUSE COME WITH YOU TO THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.

1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

1	CELL FREQ	29	55	84
	% ROW	34.5	65.5	
	% COL	36.7	38.5	
	% TABLE	13.1	24.8	37.8

2	CELL FREQ	16	33	49
	% ROW	32.7	67.3	
	% COL	20.3	23.1	
	% TABLE	7.2	14.9	22.1

3	CELL FREQ	28	46	74
	% ROW	37.8	62.2	
	% COL	35.4	32.2	
	% TABLE	12.6	20.7	33.3

4	CELL FREQ	6	9	15
	% ROW	40.0	60.0	
	% COL	7.6	6.3	
	% TABLE	2.7	4.1	6.8

	TL COL FREQ	79	143	222
	% TABLE	35.59	64.41	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 19 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 7.88

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 0.5164 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.9153

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.00000
ROW	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
COLUMN	COLUMN	0.00000
ROW	ROW	0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BRONX; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 2. DID YOUR SPOUSE COME WITH YOU TO THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS
1	CELL FREQ	0	2	2
	% ROW	0.0	100.0	
	% COL	0.0	1.3	
	% TABLE	0.0	0.9	0.9
2	CELL FREQ	5	19	24
	% ROW	20.8	79.2	
	% COL	6.1	12.5	
	% TABLE	2.1	8.1	10.3
3	CELL FREQ	4	11	15
	% ROW	26.7	73.3	
	% COL	4.9	7.2	
	% TABLE	1.7	4.7	6.4
4	CELL FREQ	12	10	22
	% ROW	54.5	45.5	
	% COL	14.6	6.6	
	% TABLE	5.1	4.3	9.4
5	CELL FREQ	11	15	26
	% ROW	42.3	57.7	
	% COL	13.4	9.9	
	% TABLE	4.7	6.4	11.1
6	CELL FREQ	5	9	14
	% ROW	35.7	64.3	
	% COL	6.1	5.9	
	% TABLE	2.1	3.8	6.0
7	CELL FREQ	6	19	25
	% ROW	24.0	76.0	
	% COL	7.3	12.5	
	% TABLE	2.6	8.1	10.7

TABLE 6B

8	CELL FREQ	*	9	*	9	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	50.0	*	50.0	*		*
	% COL	*	11.0	*	5.9	*		*
	% TABLE	*	3.8	*	3.8	*	7.7	*

9	CELL FREQ	*	8	*	15	*	23	*
	% ROW	*	34.8	*	65.2	*		*
	% COL	*	9.8	*	9.9	*		*
	% TABLE	*	3.4	*	6.4	*	9.8	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	2	*	2	*	4	*
	% ROW	*	50.0	*	50.0	*		*
	% COL	*	2.4	*	1.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.9	*	0.9	*	1.7	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	1	*	18	*	19	*
	% ROW	*	5.3	*	94.7	*		*
	% COL	*	1.2	*	11.8	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.4	*	7.7	*	8.1	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	9	*	9	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	50.0	*	50.0	*		*
	% COL	*	11.0	*	5.9	*		*
	% TABLE	*	3.8	*	3.8	*	7.7	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	10	*	14	*	24	*
	% ROW	*	41.7	*	58.3	*		*
	% COL	*	12.2	*	9.2	*		*
	% TABLE	*	4.3	*	6.0	*	10.3	*

	TL COL FREQ		82		152		234	
	% TABLE		35.04		64.96			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 7 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 2.90

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 21.0879 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.0491

	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.02414
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.02404
COLUMN	ROW	0.02439

TABLE 6B cont.

9	CELL FREQ	9	9	18	*
	% ROW	50.0	50.0	*	*
	% COL	11.0	5.9	*	*
	% TABLE	3.8	3.8	7.7	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
	CELL FREQ	8	15	23	*
	% ROW	34.8	65.2	*	*
	% COL	9.8	9.9	*	*
	% TABLE	3.4	6.4	9.8	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
	CELL FREQ	2	2	4	*
	% ROW	50.0	50.0	*	*
	% COL	2.4	1.3	*	*
	% TABLE	0.9	0.9	1.7	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
	CELL FREQ	1	18	19	*
	% ROW	5.3	94.7	*	*
	% COL	1.2	11.8	*	*
	% TABLE	0.4	7.7	8.1	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
	CELL FREQ	9	9	18	*
	% ROW	50.0	50.0	*	*
	% COL	11.0	5.9	*	*
	% TABLE	3.8	3.8	7.7	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
	CELL FREQ	10	14	24	*
	% ROW	41.7	58.3	*	*
	% COL	12.2	9.2	*	*
	% TABLE	4.3	6.0	10.3	*
	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
	TL COL FREQ	82	152	234	
	% TABLE	35.04	64.96		

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 7 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 2.90

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 21.0879 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.0491

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.02414
ROW	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
COLUMN	COLUMN	0.02404
	ROW	0.02439

TABLE 7A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION, 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE,
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION, 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 3. DID ANY OF YOUR CHILDREN COME WITH YOU TO THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
1			
CELL FREQ	14	44	58
% ROW	24.1	75.9	
% COL	34.1	41.5	
% TABLE	9.5	29.9	39.5
*****	*****	*****	*****
2			
CELL FREQ	9	24	33
% ROW	27.3	72.7	
% COL	22.0	22.6	
% TABLE	6.1	16.3	22.4
*****	*****	*****	*****
3			
CELL FREQ	14	29	43
% ROW	32.6	67.4	
% COL	34.1	27.4	
% TABLE	9.5	19.7	29.3
*****	*****	*****	*****
4			
CELL FREQ	4	9	13
% ROW	30.8	69.2	
% COL	9.3	8.5	
% TABLE	2.7	6.1	8.8
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	41	105	147
% TABLE	27.89	72.11	
TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241	NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 94	PERCENT OF TOTAL: 39.00	

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 0.9317 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.8178

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.00000
PREDICTOR	LAMBDA	
ROW	COLUMN	0.00000
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BRROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 3. DID ANY OF YOUR CHILDREN COME WITH YOU TO THE SUMMER INSTITUTE;
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

TOTALS

		1	2	
	*****			*****
	CELL FREQ	* 0	* 2	* 2 *
1	% ROW	* 0.0	* 100.0	*
	% COL	* 0.0	* 1.7	*
	% TABLE	* 0.0	* 1.3	* 1.3 *
	*****			*****
	CELL FREQ	* 4	* 12	* 16 *
2	% ROW	* 25.0	* 75.0	*
	% COL	* 9.8	* 10.4	*
	% TABLE	* 2.6	* 7.7	* 10.3 *
	*****			*****
	CELL FREQ	* 1	* 6	* 7 *
3	% ROW	* 14.3	* 85.7	*
	% COL	* 2.4	* 5.2	*
	% TABLE	* 0.6	* 3.8	* 4.5 *
	*****			*****
	CELL FREQ	* 7	* 9	* 16 *
4	% ROW	* 43.8	* 56.3	*
	% COL	* 17.1	* 7.8	*
	% TABLE	* 4.5	* 5.8	* 10.3 *
	*****			*****
	CELL FREQ	* 6	* 10	* 16 *
5	% ROW	* 37.5	* 62.5	*
	% COL	* 14.6	* 8.7	*
	% TABLE	* 3.8	* 6.4	* 10.3 *
	*****			*****
	CELL FREQ	* 3	* 6	* 9 *
6	% ROW	* 33.3	* 66.7	*
	% COL	* 7.3	* 5.2	*
	% TABLE	* 1.9	* 3.8	* 5.8 *
	*****			*****
	CELL FREQ	* 1	* 18	* 19 *
7	% ROW	* 5.3	* 94.7	*
	% COL	* 2.4	* 15.7	*
	% TABLE	* 0.6	* 11.5	* 12.2 *
	*****			*****

TABLE 7B

8	CELL FREQ	*	7	*	1	*	8	*
	% ROW	*	87.5	*	12.5	*		*
	% COL	*	17.1	*	0.9	*		*
	% TABLE	*	4.5	*	0.6	*	5.1	*

9	CELL FREQ	*	3	*	16	*	19	*
	% ROW	*	15.8	*	84.2	*		*
	% COL	*	7.3	*	13.9	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.9	*	10.3	*	12.2	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	2	*	1	*	3	*
	% ROW	*	66.7	*	33.3	*		*
	% COL	*	4.9	*	0.9	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.3	*	0.6	*	1.9	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	0	*	15	*	15	*
	% ROW	*	0.0	*	100.0	*		*
	% COL	*	0.0	*	13.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.0	*	9.6	*	9.6	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	4	*	6	*	10	*
	% ROW	*	40.0	*	60.0	*		*
	% COL	*	9.8	*	5.2	*		*
	% TABLE	*	2.6	*	3.8	*	6.4	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	3	*	13	*	16	*
	% ROW	*	18.8	*	81.3	*		*
	% COL	*	7.3	*	11.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.9	*	8.3	*	10.3	*

	TL COL FRQ		41		115		156	
	% TABLE		26.28		73.72			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 85 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 35.27

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 35.2361 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.0004

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.07303
ROW	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
COLUMN	COLUMN	0.04380
	ROW	0.17073

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 4. WHO IS PAYING FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = I AM PAYING THE TOTAL COST MYSELF.
2 = I AM PAYING A PORTION OF THE COST AND MY SCHOOL IS PAYING A PORTION.
3 = MY SCHOOL IS PAYING THE TOTAL COST.

		1	2	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	* 82	* 1	* 83
1	% ROW	* 98.8	* 1.2	*
	% COL	* 38.0	* 20.0	*
	% TABLE	* 37.1	* 0.5	* 37.6

	CELL FREQ	* 49	* 0	* 49
2	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	*
	% COL	* 22.7	* 0.0	*
	% TABLE	* 22.2	* 0.0	* 22.2

	CELL FREQ	* 71	* 3	* 74
3	% ROW	* 95.9	* 4.1	*
	% COL	* 32.9	* 60.0	*
	% TABLE	* 32.1	* 1.4	* 33.5

	CELL FREQ	* 14	* 1	* 15
4	% ROW	* 93.3	* 6.7	*
	% COL	* 6.5	* 20.0	*
	% TABLE	* 6.3	* 0.5	* 6.8

	TL COL FREQ	216	5	221
	% TABLE	97.74	2.26	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 20 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 8.30

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 3.9441 1 DF = 3 ; P = 0.2676

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.01399

CRITERION

PREDICTOR

LAMBDA

ROW

COLUMN

0.01449

COLUMN

ROW

0.00000

TABLE 8A

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 4. WHO IS PAYING FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = I AM PAYING THE TOTAL COST MYSELF.
2 = I AM PAYING A PORTION OF THE COST AND MY SCHOOL IS PAYING A PORTION.
3 = MY SCHOOL IS PAYING THE TOTAL COST.

		1	2	TOTALS
	*****	*****	*****	*****
1	CELL FREQ	* 2	* 0	* 2 *
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 0.9	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 0.9	* 0.0	* 0.9 *
	*****	*****	*****	*****
2	CELL FREQ	* 26	* 0	* 26 *
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 11.4	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 11.2	* 0.0	* 11.2 *
	*****	*****	*****	*****
3	CELL FREQ	* 15	* 0	* 15 *
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 6.6	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 6.4	* 0.0	* 6.4 *
	*****	*****	*****	*****
4	CELL FREQ	* 22	* 0	* 22 *
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 9.6	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 9.4	* 0.0	* 9.4 *
	*****	*****	*****	*****
5	CELL FREQ	* 26	* 0	* 26 *
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 11.4	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 11.2	* 0.0	* 11.2 *
	*****	*****	*****	*****
6	CELL FREQ	* 12	* 0	* 12 *
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 5.3	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 5.2	* 0.0	* 5.2 *
	*****	*****	*****	*****
7	CELL FREQ	* 23	* 2	* 25 *
	% ROW	* 92.0	* 8.0	* *
	% COL	* 10.1	* 40.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 9.9	* 0.9	* 10.7 *
	*****	*****	*****	*****

TABLE 8B

8	CELL FREQ	*	18	*	0	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	7.9	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	7.7	*	0.0	*	7.7	*

9	CELL FREQ	*	20	*	3	*	23	*
	% ROW	*	87.0	*	13.0	*		*
	% COL	*	8.8	*	60.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	8.6	*	1.3	*	9.9	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	4	*	0	*	4	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	1.8	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.7	*	0.0	*	1.7	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	18	*	0	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	7.9	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	7.7	*	0.0	*	7.7	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	18	*	0	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	7.9	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	7.7	*	0.0	*	7.7	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	24	*	0	*	24	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	10.5	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	10.3	*	0.0	*	10.3	*

	TL COL FRQ		228		5		233	
	% TABLE		97.85		2.15			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 8 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 3.32

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 21.1445 , DF = 12 , P = 0.0483

	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.01415
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.01449
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 5. HOW MUCH DO YOU ESTIMATE THAT THE SUMMER INSTITUTE HAS COST YOU.
1 = LESS THAN \$50; 2 = \$50-\$100; 3 = \$101-\$200; 4 = \$201-\$300; 5 = \$301-\$400;
6 = \$400-\$500; 7 = MORE THAN \$500.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	TOTALS

1	CELL FREQ	3	12	20	13	15	10	10	83
	% ROW	3.6	14.5	24.1	15.7	18.1	12.0	12.0	
	% COL	23.1	44.4	42.6	34.2	46.9	33.3	35.7	
	% TABLE	1.4	5.6	9.3	6.0	7.0	4.7	4.7	38.6

2	CELL FREQ	3	7	6	8	7	7	10	48
	% ROW	6.3	14.6	12.5	16.7	14.6	14.6	20.8	
	% COL	23.1	25.9	12.8	21.1	21.9	23.3	35.7	
	% TABLE	1.4	3.3	2.8	3.7	3.3	3.3	4.7	22.3

3	CELL FREQ	4	6	19	15	7	12	6	69
	% ROW	5.8	8.7	27.5	21.7	10.1	17.4	8.7	
	% COL	30.8	22.2	40.4	39.5	21.9	40.0	21.4	
	% TABLE	1.9	2.8	8.8	7.0	3.3	5.6	2.8	32.1

4	CELL FREQ	3	2	2	2	3	1	2	15
	% ROW	20.0	13.3	13.3	13.3	20.0	6.7	13.3	
	% COL	23.1	7.4	4.3	5.3	9.4	3.3	7.1	
	% TABLE	1.4	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.4	0.5	0.9	7.0

	TL COL FREQ	13	27	47	38	32	30	28	215
	% TABLE	6.05	12.56	21.86	17.67	14.88	13.95	13.02	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 26 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 10.79

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 18.0882 ; DF = 18 ; P = 0.4499

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.03333

CRITERION

PREDICTOR

LAMBDA

ROW

COLUMN

0.03788

COLUMN

ROW

0.02976

TABLE 9A

ROWS REPRESENT:

CLUSTER: 1=BRROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 5. HOW MUCH DO YOU ESTIMATE THAT THE SUMMER INSTITUTE HAS COST YOU.

1 = LESS THAN \$50; 2 = \$50-\$100; 3 = \$101-\$200; 4 = \$201-\$300; 5 = \$301-\$400;
6 = \$400-\$500; 7 = MORE THAN \$500.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	TOTALS
1	CELL FREQ	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	% ROW	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	% COL	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	% TABLE	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
2	CELL FREQ	0	0	0	7	6	6	5	24
	% ROW	0.0	0.0	0.0	29.2	25.0	25.0	20.8	
	% COL	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.4	18.8	17.6	17.2	
	% TABLE	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	2.7	2.7	2.2	10.7
3	CELL FREQ	0	0	3	5	4	1	1	14
	% ROW	0.0	0.0	21.4	35.7	28.6	7.1	7.1	
	% COL	0.0	0.0	6.1	13.2	12.5	2.9	3.4	
	% TABLE	0.0	0.0	1.3	2.2	1.8	0.4	0.4	6.2
4	CELL FREQ	0	6	7	6	1	2	0	22
	% ROW	0.0	27.3	31.8	27.3	4.5	9.1	0.0	
	% COL	0.0	22.2	14.3	15.8	3.1	5.9	0.0	
	% TABLE	0.0	2.7	3.1	2.7	0.4	0.9	0.0	9.8
5	CELL FREQ	0	2	12	7	4	0	0	25
	% ROW	0.0	8.0	48.0	28.0	16.0	0.0	0.0	
	% COL	0.0	7.4	24.5	18.4	12.5	0.0	0.0	
	% TABLE	0.0	0.9	5.3	3.1	1.8	0.0	0.0	11.1
6	CELL FREQ	0	0	2	1	5	2	3	13
	% ROW	0.0	0.0	15.4	7.7	38.5	15.4	23.1	
	% COL	0.0	0.0	4.1	2.6	15.6	5.9	10.3	
	% TABLE	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.4	2.2	0.9	1.3	5.8
7	CELL FREQ	13	7	2	1	0	0	1	24
	% ROW	54.2	29.2	8.3	4.2	0.0	0.0	4.2	
	% COL	81.3	25.9	4.1	2.6	0.0	0.0	3.4	
	% TABLE	5.8	3.1	0.9	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4	10.7

TABLE 9B

8	CELL FREQ	*	0	*	0	*	2	*	3	*	6	*	1	*	5	*	17	*
	% ROW	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	11.8	*	17.6	*	35.3	*	5.9	*	29.4	*		*
	% COL	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	4.1	*	7.9	*	18.8	*	2.9	*	17.2	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	0.9	*	1.3	*	2.7	*	0.4	*	2.2	*	7.6	*

9	CELL FREQ	*	0	*	9	*	12	*	2	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	23	*
	% ROW	*	0.0	*	39.1	*	52.2	*	8.7	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	0.0	*	33.3	*	24.5	*	5.3	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.0	*	4.0	*	5.3	*	0.9	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	10.2	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	0	*	0	*	3	*	1	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	4	*
	% ROW	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	75.0	*	25.0	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	6.1	*	2.6	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	1.3	*	0.4	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	1.8	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	0	*	1	*	0	*	0	*	3	*	7	*	7	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	0.0	*	5.6	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	16.7	*	38.9	*	38.9	*		*
	% COL	*	0.0	*	3.7	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	9.4	*	20.6	*	24.1	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.0	*	0.4	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	1.3	*	3.1	*	3.1	*	8.0	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	1	*	2	*	6	*	5	*	2	*	0	*	0	*	16	*
	% ROW	*	6.3	*	12.5	*	37.5	*	31.3	*	12.5	*	0.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	6.3	*	7.4	*	12.2	*	13.2	*	6.3	*	0.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.4	*	0.9	*	2.7	*	2.2	*	0.9	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	7.1	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	1	*	15	*	7	*	23	*
	% ROW	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	3.3	*	65.2	*	30.4	*		*
	% COL	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	3.1	*	44.1	*	24.1	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	0.4	*	6.7	*	3.1	*	10.2	*

	TL COL FREQ		16		27		49		38		32		34		29		225	
	% TABLE		7.11		12.00		21.78		16.89		14.22		15.11		12.89			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 16 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 6.64

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 336.3201 ; DF = 72 ; P = 0.0000

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.25266

CRITERION

PREDICTOR

LAMBDA

ROW

COLUMN

0.22000

COLUMN

ROW

0.28977

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 6. DID YOU BORROW MONEY FROM A FEDERALLY INSURED LOAN TO HELP PAY FOR
YOUR COSTS FOR THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		TOTALS	
		1	2

1	CELL FREQ	2	84
	% ROW	2.3	97.7
	% COL	15.4	39.8
	% TABLE	0.9	37.5

2	CELL FREQ	6	44
	% ROW	12.0	88.0
	% COL	46.2	20.9
	% TABLE	2.7	19.6

3	CELL FREQ	1	73
	% ROW	1.4	98.6
	% COL	7.7	34.6
	% TABLE	0.4	32.6

4	CELL FREQ	4	10
	% ROW	28.6	71.4
	% COL	30.8	4.7
	% TABLE	1.8	4.5

	TL COL FREQ	13	211
	% TABLE	5.80	94.20

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 17 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 7.05

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 21.3731 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.0001

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.02649

CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.02899
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

TABLE 10A

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 6. DID YOU BORROW MONEY FROM A FEDERALLY INSURED LOAN TO HELP PAY FOR
YOUR COSTS FOR THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	* 0	* 2	* 2 *
1	% ROW	* 0.0	* 100.0	* *
	% COL	* 0.0	* 0.9	* *
	% TABLE	* 0.0	* 0.9	* 0.9 *

	CELL FREQ	* 1	* 25	* 26 *
2	% ROW	* 3.8	* 96.2	* *
	% COL	* 7.7	* 11.3	* *
	% TABLE	* 0.4	* 10.7	* 11.1 *

	CELL FREQ	* 0	* 14	* 14 *
3	% ROW	* 0.0	* 100.0	* *
	% COL	* 0.0	* 6.3	* *
	% TABLE	* 0.0	* 6.0	* 6.0 *

	CELL FREQ	* 2	* 20	* 22 *
4	% ROW	* 9.1	* 90.9	* *
	% COL	* 15.4	* 9.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 0.9	* 8.5	* 9.4 *

	CELL FREQ	* 1	* 25	* 26 *
5	% ROW	* 3.8	* 96.2	* *
	% COL	* 7.7	* 11.3	* *
	% TABLE	* 0.4	* 10.7	* 11.1 *

	CELL FREQ	* 1	* 13	* 14 *
6	% ROW	* 7.1	* 92.9	* *
	% COL	* 7.7	* 5.9	* *
	% TABLE	* 0.4	* 5.6	* 6.0 *

	CELL FREQ	* 1	* 24	* 25 *
7	% ROW	* 4.0	* 96.0	* *
	% COL	* 7.7	* 10.9	* *
	% TABLE	* 0.4	* 10.3	* 10.7 *

TABLE 10B

	CELL FREQ	*	1	*	17	*	18	*
8	% ROW	*	5.6	*	94.4	*		*
	% COL	*	7.7	*	7.7	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.4	*	7.3	*	7.7	*

	CELL FREQ	*	1	*	22	*	23	*
9	% ROW	*	4.3	*	95.7	*		*
	% COL	*	7.7	*	10.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.4	*	9.4	*	9.8	*

	CELL FREQ	*	0	*	4	*	4	*
10	% ROW	*	0.0	*	100.0	*		*
	% COL	*	0.0	*	1.8	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.0	*	1.7	*	1.7	*

	CELL FREQ	*	4	*	14	*	18	*
11	% ROW	*	22.2	*	77.8	*		*
	% COL	*	30.8	*	6.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.7	*	6.0	*	7.7	*

	CELL FREQ	*	0	*	18	*	18	*
12	% ROW	*	0.0	*	100.0	*		*
	% COL	*	0.0	*	8.1	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.0	*	7.7	*	7.7	*

	CELL FREQ	*	1	*	23	*	24	*
13	% ROW	*	4.2	*	95.8	*		*
	% COL	*	7.7	*	10.4	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.4	*	9.8	*	10.3	*

	TL COL FREQ		13		221		234	
	% TABLE		5.56		94.44			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 7 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 2.90

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 12.9130 DF = 12 P = 0.3754

	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :		0.01357
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA	
ROW	COLUMN	0.01442	
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000	

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 7. IN YOUR OPINION, WAS ONE WEEK LONG ENOUGH FOR THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

1	CELL FREQ	* 80	* 6	* 86 *
	% ROW	* 93.0	* 7.0	* *
	% COL	* 37.2	* 66.7	* *
	% TABLE	* 35.7	* 2.7	* 38.4 *

2	CELL FREQ	* 49	* 0	* 49 *
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 22.8	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 21.9	* 0.0	* 21.9 *

3	CELL FREQ	* 71	* 3	* 74 *
	% ROW	* 95.9	* 4.1	* *
	% COL	* 33.0	* 33.3	* *
	% TABLE	* 31.7	* 1.3	* 33.0 *

4	CELL FREQ	* 15	* 0	* 15 *
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 7.0	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 6.7	* 0.0	* 6.7 *

	TL COL FREQ	215	9	224
	% TABLE	95.98	4.02	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 17 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 7.05

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 4.6317 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.2008

	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.00000
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.00000
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

TABLE 11A

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 7. IN YOUR OPINION, WAS ONE WEEK LONG ENOUGH FOR THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS
1	*****			
	CELL FREQ	* 2	* 0	* 2 *
1	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 0.9	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 0.8	* 0.0	* 0.8 *

	CELL FREQ	* 25	* 1	* 26 *
2	% ROW	* 96.2	* 3.8	* *
	% COL	* 11.0	* 11.1	* *
	% TABLE	* 10.6	* 0.4	* 11.0 *

	CELL FREQ	* 15	* 0	* 15 *
3	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 6.6	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 6.4	* 0.0	* 6.4 *

	CELL FREQ	* 19	* 2	* 21 *
4	% ROW	* 90.5	* 9.5	* *
	% COL	* 8.4	* 22.2	* *
	% TABLE	* 8.1	* 0.8	* 8.9 *

	CELL FREQ	* 24	* 2	* 26 *
5	% ROW	* 92.3	* 7.7	* *
	% COL	* 10.6	* 22.2	* *
	% TABLE	* 10.2	* 0.8	* 11.0 *

	CELL FREQ	* 14	* 0	* 14 *
6	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 6.2	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 5.9	* 0.0	* 5.9 *

	CELL FREQ	* 26	* 0	* 26 *
7	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 11.5	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 11.0	* 0.0	* 11.0 *

TABLE 11B

```

      CELL FREQ *    18 *    0 *    18 *
8  % ROW      * 100.0 *    0.0 *
   % COL      *    7.9 *    0.0 *
   % TABLE   *    7.6 *    0.0 *    7.6 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *    22 *    1 *    23 *
9  % ROW      *   95.7 *    4.3 *
   % COL      *    9.7 *   11.1 *
   % TABLE   *    9.3 *    0.4 *    9.7 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *    4 *    0 *    4 *
10 % ROW      * 100.0 *    0.0 *
   % COL      *    1.8 *    0.0 *
   % TABLE   *    1.7 *    0.0 *    1.7 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *    19 *    0 *    19 *
11 % ROW      * 100.0 *    0.0 *
   % COL      *    8.4 *    0.0 *
   % TABLE   *    8.1 *    0.0 *    8.1 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *    17 *    1 *    18 *
12 % ROW      *   94.4 *    5.6 *
   % COL      *    7.5 *   11.1 *
   % TABLE   *    7.2 *    0.4 *    7.6 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *    22 *    2 *    24 *
13 % ROW      *   91.7 *    8.3 *
   % COL      *    9.7 *   22.2 *
   % TABLE   *    9.3 *    0.8 *   10.2 *
*****
      TL COL FRQ    227      9      236
      % TABLE    96.19    3.81

```

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 5 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 2.07

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 8.3221 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.7595

CRITERION	PREDICTOR	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.00913	0.00952
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000	

TABLE 12A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 8. HOW LONG DID YOU (OR WILL YOU) STAY IN SOUTH FLORIDA.
1 = JUST FOR THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
2 = ADDITIONAL DAYS.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	41	18	59
% ROW	69.5	30.5	*
% COL	37.3	39.1	*
% TABLE	26.3	11.5	37.8
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	24	13	37
% ROW	64.9	35.1	*
% COL	21.8	28.3	*
% TABLE	15.4	8.3	23.7
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	38	13	51
% ROW	74.5	25.5	*
% COL	34.5	28.3	*
% TABLE	24.4	8.3	32.7
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	7	2	9
% ROW	77.8	22.2	*
% COL	6.4	4.3	*
% TABLE	4.5	1.3	5.8
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL CHL FREQ	110	46	156
% TABLE	70.51	29.49	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 85 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 35.27

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 1.2176 / DF = 3 / P = 0.7488

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.00000
PREDICTOR	LAMBDA	
ROW	COLUMN	0.00000
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 8. HOW LONG DID YOU (OR WILL YOU) STAY IN SOUTH FLORIDA.
1 = JUST FOR THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
2 = ADDITIONAL DAYS.

		1	2	TOTAL

	CELL FREQ	0	0	0
1	% ROW	0.0	0.0	
	% COL	0.0	0.0	
	% TABLE	0.0	0.0	0.0

	CELL FREQ	13	10	23
2	% ROW	56.5	43.5	
	% COL	11.2	22.2	
	% TABLE	9.1	6.2	14.3

	CELL FREQ	11	3	14
3	% ROW	78.6	21.4	
	% COL	9.5	6.7	
	% TABLE	6.8	1.9	8.7

	CELL FREQ	7	2	9
4	% ROW	77.8	22.2	
	% COL	6.0	4.4	
	% TABLE	4.3	1.2	5.6

	CELL FREQ	17	6	23
5	% ROW	73.9	26.1	
	% COL	14.7	13.3	
	% TABLE	10.6	3.7	14.3

	CELL FREQ	6	5	11
6	% ROW	54.5	45.5	
	% COL	5.2	11.1	
	% TABLE	3.7	3.1	6.8

	CELL FREQ	0	0	0
7	% ROW	0.0	0.0	
	% COL	0.0	0.0	
	% TABLE	0.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE 12B

8	CELL FREQ	*	8	*	6	*	14	*
	% ROW	*	57.1	*	42.9	*		*
	% COL	*	6.9	*	13.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	5.0	*	3.7	*	8.7	*

9	CELL FREQ	*	15	*	1	*	16	*
	% ROW	*	93.8	*	6.3	*		*
	% COL	*	12.9	*	2.2	*		*
	% TABLE	*	9.3	*	0.6	*	9.9	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	3	*	1	*	4	*
	% ROW	*	75.0	*	25.0	*		*
	% COL	*	2.6	*	2.2	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.9	*	0.6	*	2.5	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	13	*	4	*	17	*
	% ROW	*	76.5	*	23.5	*		*
	% COL	*	11.2	*	8.9	*		*
	% TABLE	*	8.1	*	2.5	*	10.6	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	8	*	1	*	9	*
	% ROW	*	88.9	*	11.1	*		*
	% COL	*	6.9	*	2.2	*		*
	% TABLE	*	5.0	*	0.6	*	5.6	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	15	*	6	*	21	*
	% ROW	*	71.4	*	28.6	*		*
	% COL	*	12.9	*	13.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	9.3	*	3.7	*	13.0	*

	TL COL FREQ		116		45		161	
	% TABLE		72.05		27.95			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 80 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 33.20

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 9. IN YOUR OPINION, WHEN IS THE BEST TIME TO SCHEDULE THE NEXT SUMMER
INSTITUTE. 1=EARLY JUNE; 2=MID JUNE; 3=LATE JUNE; 4=EARLY JULY; 5=MID JULY;
6=LATE JULY; 7=EARLY AUGUST; 8=MID AUGUST; 9=LATE AUGUST.

TABLE 13A

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	TOTALS
1	CELL FREQ	1	1	2	1	2	36	6	2	60
	% ROW	1.7	1.7	3.3	1.7	3.3	60.0	10.0	3.3	
	% COL	33.3	14.3	100.0	25.0	47.4	34.0	54.5	16.7	
	% TABLE	0.6	0.6	1.2	0.6	1.2	21.6	3.6	1.2	35.9
2	CELL FREQ	0	5	0	0	3	27	1	3	40
	% ROW	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	7.5	67.5	2.5	7.5	
	% COL	0.0	71.4	0.0	0.0	15.8	25.5	9.1	25.0	
	% TABLE	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	16.2	0.6	1.8	24.0
3	CELL FREQ	2	1	0	2	6	36	4	6	57
	% ROW	3.5	1.8	0.0	3.5	10.5	63.2	7.0	10.5	
	% COL	66.7	14.3	0.0	50.0	31.6	34.0	36.4	50.0	
	% TABLE	1.2	0.6	0.0	1.2	3.6	21.6	2.4	3.6	34.1
4	CELL FREQ	0	0	0	1	1	7	0	1	10
	% ROW	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	70.0	0.0	10.0	
	% COL	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	5.3	6.6	0.0	8.3	
	% TABLE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	4.2	0.0	0.6	6.0
	TL COL FREQ	3	7	2	4	19	106	11	12	167
	% TABLE	1.80	4.19	1.20	2.40	11.38	63.47	6.59	7.19	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 74 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 30.71

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 26.5792 ; DF = 24 ; P = 0.3244

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.05952

CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.09346
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BRØWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 9. IN YOUR OPINION, WHEN IS THE BEST TIME TO SCHEDULE THE NEXT SUMMER
INSTITUTE. 1=EARLY JUNE; 2=MID JUNE; 3=LATE JUNE; 4=EARLY JULY; 5=MID JULY;
6=LATE JULY; 7=EARLY AUGUST; 8=MID AUGUST; 9=LATE AUGUST.

TABLE 13B

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	TOTALS
1	CELL FREQ	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	% ROW	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
	% COL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	
	% TABLE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.6
2	CELL FREQ	0	3	1	0	2	1	6	2	19
	% ROW	0.0	15.8	5.3	0.0	10.5	5.3	31.6	10.5	21.1
	% COL	0.0	42.9	50.0	0.0	66.7	4.8	5.5	18.2	30.8
	% TABLE	0.0	1.7	0.6	0.0	1.1	0.6	3.4	1.1	2.3
3	CELL FREQ	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	0	15
	% ROW	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	13.3	60.0	0.0	20.0
	% COL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	9.5	8.3	0.0	23.1
	% TABLE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.1	5.1	0.0	1.7
4	CELL FREQ	0	1	0	0	0	3	13	1	18
	% ROW	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	72.2	5.6	0.0
	% COL	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	11.9	9.1	0.0
	% TABLE	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	7.4	0.6	0.0
5	CELL FREQ	0	2	0	0	0	1	14	3	20
	% ROW	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	70.0	15.0	0.0
	% COL	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	12.8	27.3	0.0
	% TABLE	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	8.0	1.7	0.0
6	CELL FREQ	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	4
	% ROW	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0
	% COL	0.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	7.7
	% TABLE	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.6	2.3
7	CELL FREQ	1	0	0	1	0	4	9	0	17
	% ROW	5.3	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	23.5	52.9	0.0	11.8
	% COL	20.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	19.0	8.3	0.0	15.4
	% TABLE	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	2.3	5.1	0.0	1.1



ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE:	241	NUMBER NOT RESPONDING:	66	PERCENT OF TOTAL:	27.39
--------------------	-----	------------------------	----	-------------------	-------

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.07240

0.01515

TABLE 14A

R9WS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION, 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE,
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION, 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 10. DID YOU HAVE ENOUGH FREE TIME DURING THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES, 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	63	22	85
% ROW	74.1	25.9	*
% COL	41.2	31.4	*
% TABLE	28.3	9.9	38.1
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	34	16	50
% ROW	68.0	32.0	*
% COL	22.2	22.9	*
% TABLE	15.2	7.2	22.4
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	47	26	73
% ROW	64.4	35.6	*
% COL	30.7	37.1	*
% TABLE	21.1	11.7	32.7
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	9	6	15
% ROW	60.0	40.0	*
% COL	5.9	8.6	*
% TABLE	4.0	2.7	6.7
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	153	70	223
% TABLE	68.61	31.39	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 18 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 7.47

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 2.3276 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.5072

CRITERION PREDICTOR LAMBDA : 0.01923
ROW COLUMN LAMBDA
COLUMN ROW
0.02399
0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER; 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 10. DID YOU HAVE ENOUGH FREE TIME DURING THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		TOTALS		
		1	2	

1	CELL FREQ	2	0	2
	% ROW	100.0	0.0	
	% COL	1.2	0.0	
	% TABLE	0.9	0.0	0.9

2	CELL FREQ	12	14	26
	% ROW	46.2	53.8	
	% COL	7.4	19.2	
	% TABLE	5.1	6.0	11.1

3	CELL FREQ	8	7	15
	% ROW	53.3	46.7	
	% COL	4.9	9.6	
	% TABLE	3.4	3.0	6.4

4	CELL FREQ	13	9	22
	% ROW	59.1	40.9	
	% COL	8.0	12.3	
	% TABLE	5.5	3.8	9.4

5	CELL FREQ	22	3	25
	% ROW	88.0	12.0	
	% COL	13.6	4.1	
	% TABLE	9.4	1.3	10.6

6	CELL FREQ	10	4	14
	% ROW	71.4	28.6	
	% COL	6.2	5.5	
	% TABLE	4.3	1.7	6.0

7	CELL FREQ	18	8	26
	% ROW	69.2	30.8	
	% COL	11.1	11.0	
	% TABLE	7.7	3.4	11.1

TABLE 14B

8	CELL FREQ	*	8	*	10	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	44.4	*	55.6	*		*
	% COL	*	4.9	*	13.7	*		*
	% TABLE	*	3.4	*	4.3	*	7.7	*

9	CELL FREQ	*	21	*	2	*	23	*
	% ROW	*	91.3	*	8.7	*		*
	% COL	*	13.0	*	2.7	*		*
	% TABLE	*	8.9	*	0.9	*	9.8	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	4	*	0	*	4	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	2.5	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.7	*	0.0	*	1.7	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	14	*	4	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	77.8	*	22.2	*		*
	% COL	*	8.6	*	5.5	*		*
	% TABLE	*	6.0	*	1.7	*	7.7	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	11	*	7	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	61.1	*	38.9	*		*
	% COL	*	6.8	*	9.6	*		*
	% TABLE	*	4.7	*	3.0	*	7.7	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	19	*	5	*	24	*
	% ROW	*	79.2	*	20.8	*		*
	% COL	*	11.7	*	6.8	*		*
	% TABLE	*	8.1	*	2.1	*	10.2	*

	TL COL FRQ		162		73		235	
	% TABLE		68.94		31.06			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 6 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 2.49

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 28.7518 , DF = 12 , P = 0.0043

	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.04965
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.04785
COLUMN	ROW	0.05479

TABLE 15A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION; 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 11. HSN WOULD YOU RATE THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.

1 = EXCELLENT; 2 = GOOD; 3 = FAIR; 4 = POOR.

	1	2	3	4	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	42	38	4	1	85
% ROW	49.4	44.7	4.7	1.2	*
% COL	39.3	43.2	18.2	33.3	*
% TABLE	19.1	17.3	1.8	0.5	38.6
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	22	21	6	1	50
% ROW	44.0	42.0	12.0	2.0	*
% COL	20.6	23.9	27.3	33.3	*
% TABLE	10.0	9.5	2.7	0.5	22.7
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	34	24	11	1	70
% ROW	48.6	34.3	15.7	1.4	*
% COL	31.8	27.3	50.0	33.3	*
% TABLE	15.5	10.9	5.0	0.5	31.8
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	9	5	1	0	15
% ROW	60.0	33.3	6.7	0.0	*
% COL	8.4	5.7	4.5	0.0	*
% TABLE	4.1	2.3	0.5	0.0	6.3
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	107	88	22	3	220
% TABLE	48.64	40.00	10.00	1.36	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 21 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 8.71

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 7.3003 , DF = 9 , P = 0.6059

CRITERION PREDICTOR LAMBDA : 0.02823
ROW COLUMN ROW COLUMN
LAMBDA
0.05185
0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 1. HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = EXCELLENT; 2 = GOOD; 3 = FAIR; 4 = POOR.

		TOTALS			
		1	2	3	4

	CELL FREQ	* 2	* 0	* 0	* 0
1	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* 0.0	* 0.0
	% COL	* 1.8	* 0.0	* 0.0	* 0.0
	% TABLE	* 0.9	* 0.0	* 0.0	* 0.9

	CELL FREQ	* 4	* 15	* 5	* 1
2	% ROW	* 16.0	* 60.0	* 20.0	* 4.0
	% COL	* 3.5	* 16.3	* 21.7	* 33.3
	% TABLE	* 1.7	* 6.5	* 2.2	* 0.4

	CELL FREQ	* 4	* 10	* 0	* 0
3	% ROW	* 28.6	* 71.4	* 0.0	* 0.0
	% COL	* 3.5	* 10.9	* 0.0	* 0.0
	% TABLE	* 1.7	* 4.3	* 0.0	* 0.0

	CELL FREQ	* 11	* 8	* 3	* 0
4	% ROW	* 50.0	* 36.4	* 13.6	* 0.0
	% COL	* 9.7	* 8.7	* 13.0	* 0.0
	% TABLE	* 4.8	* 3.5	* 1.3	* 0.0

	CELL FREQ	* 17	* 8	* 0	* 0
5	% ROW	* 68.0	* 32.0	* 0.0	* 0.0
	% COL	* 15.0	* 8.7	* 0.0	* 0.0
	% TABLE	* 7.4	* 3.5	* 0.0	* 0.0

	CELL FREQ	* 7	* 4	* 3	* 0
6	% ROW	* 50.0	* 28.6	* 21.4	* 0.0
	% COL	* 6.2	* 4.3	* 13.0	* 0.0
	% TABLE	* 3.0	* 1.7	* 1.3	* 0.0

	CELL FREQ	* 10	* 11	* 3	* 1
7	% ROW	* 40.0	* 44.0	* 12.0	* 4.0
	% COL	* 8.8	* 12.0	* 13.0	* 33.3
	% TABLE	* 4.3	* 4.8	* 1.3	* 0.4

TABLE 15B

8	CELL FREQ	* 6	* 10	* 2	* 0	* 18	*
	% ROW	* 33.3	* 55.6	* 11.1	* 0.0	*	
	% COL	* 5.3	* 10.9	* 8.7	* 0.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 2.6	* 4.3	* 0.9	* 0.0	* 7.8	*

9	CELL FREQ	* 22	* 1	* 0	* 0	* 23	*
	% ROW	* 95.7	* 4.3	* 0.0	* 0.0	*	
	% COL	* 19.5	* 1.1	* 0.0	* 0.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 9.5	* 0.4	* 0.0	* 0.0	* 10.0	*

10	CELL FREQ	* 4	* 0	* 0	* 0	* 4	*
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* 0.0	* 0.0	*	
	% COL	* 3.5	* 0.0	* 0.0	* 0.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 1.7	* 0.0	* 0.0	* 0.0	* 1.7	*

11	CELL FREQ	* 9	* 6	* 3	* 1	* 19	*
	% ROW	* 47.4	* 31.6	* 15.8	* 5.3	*	
	% COL	* 8.0	* 6.5	* 13.0	* 33.3	*	
	% TABLE	* 3.9	* 2.6	* 1.3	* 0.4	* 8.2	*

12	CELL FREQ	* 6	* 7	* 3	* 0	* 16	*
	% ROW	* 37.5	* 43.8	* 18.8	* 0.0	*	
	% COL	* 5.3	* 7.6	* 13.0	* 0.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 2.6	* 3.0	* 1.3	* 0.0	* 6.9	*

13	CELL FREQ	* 11	* 12	* 1	* 0	* 24	*
	% ROW	* 45.8	* 50.0	* 4.2	* 0.0	*	
	% COL	* 9.7	* 13.0	* 4.3	* 0.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 4.8	* 5.2	* 0.4	* 0.0	* 10.4	*

	TL COL FREQ	113	92	23	3	231	
	% TABLE	48.92	39.83	9.96	1.30		

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 10 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 4.15

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 64.1953 ; DF = 36 ; P = 0.0026

	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.12963
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.08738
COLUMN	ROW	0.20339

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 12. WOULD YOU PREFER TO ATTEND A REGIONAL SUMMER INSTITUTE (FOR EXAMPLE, IN
CALIFORNIA, NEW YORK, OR FT. LAUDERDALE) RATHER THAN A NATIONAL INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

1	CELL FREQ	* 14	* 60	* 74 *
	% ROW	* 18.9	* 81.1	*
	% COL	* 26.9	* 44.4	*
	% TABLE	* 7.5	* 32.1	* 39.6 *

2	CELL FREQ	* 17	* 26	* 43 *
	% ROW	* 39.5	* 60.5	*
	% COL	* 32.7	* 19.3	*
	% TABLE	* 9.1	* 13.9	* 23.0 *

3	CELL FREQ	* 15	* 42	* 57 *
	% ROW	* 26.3	* 73.7	*
	% COL	* 28.8	* 31.1	*
	% TABLE	* 8.0	* 22.5	* 30.5 *

4	CELL FREQ	* 6	* 7	* 13 *
	% ROW	* 46.2	* 53.8	*
	% COL	* 11.5	* 5.2	*
	% TABLE	* 3.2	* 3.7	* 7.0 *

	TL COL FREQ	52	135	187
	% TABLE	27.81	72.19	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 54 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 22.41

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 8.1011 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.0440

	<u>SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :</u>	0.01818
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.02655
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

TABLE 16A

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 12. WOULD YOU PREFER TO ATTEND A REGIONAL SUMMER INSTITUTE (FOR EXAMPLE, IN
CALIFORNIA, NEW YORK, OR FT. LAUDERDALE) RATHER THAN A NATIONAL INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	* 1 *	* 1 *	* 2 *
1	% ROW	* 50.0 *	* 50.0 *	
	% COL	* 1.8 *	* 0.7 *	
	% TABLE	* 0.5 *	* 0.5 *	* 1.0 *

	CELL FREQ	* 9 *	* 12 *	* 21 *
2	% ROW	* 42.9 *	* 57.1 *	
	% COL	* 15.8 *	* 8.5 *	
	% TABLE	* 4.5 *	* 6.0 *	* 10.6 *

	CELL FREQ	* 4 *	* 9 *	* 13 *
3	% ROW	* 30.8 *	* 69.2 *	
	% COL	* 7.0 *	* 6.3 *	
	% TABLE	* 2.0 *	* 4.5 *	* 6.5 *

	CELL FREQ	* 2 *	* 15 *	* 17 *
4	% ROW	* 11.8 *	* 88.2 *	
	% COL	* 3.5 *	* 10.6 *	
	% TABLE	* 1.0 *	* 7.5 *	* 8.5 *

	CELL FREQ	* 1 *	* 23 *	* 24 *
5	% ROW	* 4.2 *	* 95.8 *	
	% COL	* 1.8 *	* 16.2 *	
	% TABLE	* 0.5 *	* 11.6 *	* 12.1 *

	CELL FREQ	* 6 *	* 6 *	* 12 *
6	% ROW	* 50.0 *	* 50.0 *	
	% COL	* 10.5 *	* 4.2 *	
	% TABLE	* 3.0 *	* 3.0 *	* 6.0 *

	CELL FREQ	* 6 *	* 12 *	* 18 *
7	% ROW	* 33.3 *	* 66.7 *	
	% COL	* 10.5 *	* 8.5 *	
	% TABLE	* 3.0 *	* 6.0 *	* 9.0 *

TABLE 16B

8	CELL FREQ	*	4	*	14	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	22.2	*	77.8	*		*
	% COL	*	7.0	*	9.9	*		*
	% TABLE	*	2.0	*	7.0	*	9.0	*

	CELL FREQ	*	1	*	18	*	19	*
9	% ROW	*	5.3	*	94.7	*		*
	% COL	*	1.8	*	12.7	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.5	*	9.0	*	9.5	*

	CELL FREQ	*	0	*	3	*	3	*
10	% ROW	*	0.0	*	100.0	*		*
	% COL	*	0.0	*	2.1	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.0	*	1.5	*	1.5	*

	CELL FREQ	*	8	*	8	*	16	*
11	% ROW	*	50.0	*	50.0	*		*
	% COL	*	14.0	*	5.6	*		*
	% TABLE	*	4.0	*	4.0	*	8.0	*

	CELL FREQ	*	3	*	11	*	14	*
12	% ROW	*	21.4	*	78.6	*		*
	% COL	*	5.3	*	7.7	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.5	*	5.5	*	7.0	*

	CELL FREQ	*	12	*	10	*	22	*
13	% ROW	*	54.5	*	45.5	*		*
	% COL	*	21.1	*	7.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	6.0	*	5.0	*	12.1	*

	TL COL FRQ		57		142		199	
	% TABLE		28.64		71.36			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 42 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 17.43

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 32.6243 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.0011

CRITERION

ROW

COLUMN

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.05603

PREDICTOR

COLUMN

ROW

LAMBDA

0.06286

0.03509

TABLE 17A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 13. WOULD YOU WANT TO ATTEND A SUMMER INSTITUTE AGAIN NEXT YEAR.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	81	5	86
% ROW	94.2	5.8	*
% COL	38.8	38.5	*
% TABLE	36.5	2.3	38.7
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	47	2	49
% ROW	95.9	4.1	*
% COL	22.5	15.4	*
% TABLE	21.2	0.9	22.1
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	67	5	72
% ROW	93.1	6.9	*
% COL	32.1	38.5	*
% TABLE	30.2	2.3	32.4
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	14	1	15
% ROW	93.3	6.7	*
% COL	6.7	7.7	*
% TABLE	6.3	0.5	6.8
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	209	13	222
% TABLE	94.14	5.86	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 19 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 7.88

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 0.4527 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.9291

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.00000
ROW	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
COLUMN	COLUMN	0.00000
ROW	ROW	0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BRERARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 13. WOULD YOU WANT TO ATTEND A SUMMER INSTITUTE AGAIN NEXT YEAR.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	2	0	2
1	% ROW	100.0	0.0	
	% COL	0.9	0.0	
	% TABLE	0.9	0.0	0.9

	CELL FREQ	22	2	24
2	% ROW	91.7	8.3	
	% COL	10.0	14.3	
	% TABLE	9.4	0.9	10.3

	CELL FREQ	15	0	15
3	% ROW	100.0	0.0	
	% COL	6.8	0.0	
	% TABLE	6.4	0.0	6.4

	CELL FREQ	22	0	22
4	% ROW	100.0	0.0	
	% COL	10.0	0.0	
	% TABLE	9.4	0.0	9.4

	CELL FREQ	25	1	26
5	% ROW	96.2	3.8	
	% COL	11.4	7.1	
	% TABLE	10.7	0.4	11.2

	CELL FREQ	12	1	13
6	% ROW	92.3	7.7	
	% COL	5.5	7.1	
	% TABLE	5.2	0.4	5.6

	CELL FREQ	25	1	26
7	% ROW	96.2	3.8	
	% COL	11.4	7.1	
	% TABLE	10.7	0.4	11.2

TABLE 17B

8	CELL FREQ	*	17	*	1	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	94.4	*	5.6	*		*
	% COL	*	7.8	*	7.1	*		*
	% TABLE	*	7.3	*	0.4	*	7.7	*

9	CELL FREQ	*	22	*	1	*	23	*
	% ROW	*	95.7	*	4.3	*		*
	% COL	*	10.0	*	7.1	*		*
	% TABLE	*	9.4	*	0.4	*	9.9	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	4	*	0	*	4	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	1.8	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.7	*	0.0	*	1.7	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	16	*	2	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	88.9	*	11.1	*		*
	% COL	*	7.3	*	14.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	6.9	*	0.9	*	7.7	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	16	*	2	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	88.9	*	11.1	*		*
	% COL	*	7.3	*	14.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	6.9	*	0.9	*	7.7	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	21	*	3	*	24	*
	% ROW	*	87.5	*	12.5	*		*
	% COL	*	9.6	*	21.4	*		*
	% TABLE	*	9.0	*	1.3	*	10.3	*

	TL COL FREQ		219		14		233	
	% TABLE		93.99		6.01			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 8 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 3.32

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 7.0436 1 DF = 12 ; P = 0.8547

		SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :		0.00905
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA		
ROW	COLUMN	0.00966		
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000		

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 15A. WERE YOUR MOST PRESSING QUESTIONS ABOUT THE GENERAL PROGRAM STRUCTURE
ANSWERED DURING THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	* 76	* 7	* 83 *
1	% ROW	* 91.6	* 8.4	*
	% COL	* 38.8	* 30.4	*
	% TABLE	* 34.7	* 3.2	* 37.9 *

	CELL FREQ	* 46	* 4	* 50 *
2	% ROW	* 92.0	* 8.0	*
	% COL	* 23.5	* 17.4	*
	% TABLE	* 21.0	* 1.8	* 22.8 *

	CELL FREQ	* 64	* 9	* 73 *
3	% ROW	* 87.7	* 12.3	*
	% COL	* 32.7	* 39.1	*
	% TABLE	* 29.2	* 4.1	* 33.3 *

	CELL FREQ	* 10	* 3	* 13 *
4	% ROW	* 76.9	* 23.1	*
	% COL	* 5.1	* 13.0	*
	% TABLE	* 4.6	* 1.4	* 5.9 *

	TL COL FREQ	196	23	219
	% TABLE	89.50	10.50	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 22 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 9.13

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 3.1570 , DF = 3 , P = 0.3681

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.01258

CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.01471
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

TABLE 19A

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BRUNSWICK; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 15A. WERE YOUR MOST PRESSING QUESTIONS ABOUT THE GENERAL PROGRAM STRUCTURE
ANSWERED DURING THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS	

	CELL FREQ	2	0	2	
1	% ROW	100.0	0.0		
	% COL	1.0	0.0		
	% TABLE	0.9	0.0	0.9	

	CELL FREQ	20	6	26	
2	% ROW	76.9	23.1		
	% COL	9.8	25.0		
	% TABLE	8.7	2.6	11.4	

	CELL FREQ	14	1	15	
3	% ROW	93.3	6.7		
	% COL	6.8	4.2		
	% TABLE	6.1	0.4	6.6	

	CELL FREQ	21	1	22	
4	% ROW	95.5	4.5		
	% COL	10.2	4.2		
	% TABLE	9.2	0.4	9.6	

	CELL FREQ	24	1	25	
5	% ROW	96.0	4.0		
	% COL	11.7	4.2		
	% TABLE	10.5	0.4	10.9	

	CELL FREQ	8	3	11	
5	% ROW	72.7	27.3		
	% COL	3.9	12.5		
	% TABLE	3.5	1.3	4.8	

	CELL FREQ	25	1	26	
7	% ROW	96.2	3.8		
	% COL	12.2	4.2		
	% TABLE	10.9	0.4	11.4	

TABLE 19B

8	CELL FREQ	*	12	*	6	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	66.7	*	33.3	*		*
	% COL	*	5.9	*	25.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	5.2	*	2.6	*	7.9	*

9	CELL FREQ	*	22	*	1	*	23	*
	% ROW	*	95.7	*	4.3	*		*
	% COL	*	10.7	*	4.2	*		*
	% TABLE	*	9.6	*	0.4	*	10.0	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	4	*	0	*	4	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	2.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.7	*	0.0	*	1.7	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	17	*	2	*	19	*
	% ROW	*	89.5	*	10.5	*		*
	% COL	*	8.3	*	8.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	7.4	*	0.9	*	8.3	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	14	*	2	*	16	*
	% ROW	*	87.5	*	12.5	*		*
	% COL	*	6.8	*	8.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	5.1	*	0.9	*	7.0	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	22	*	0	*	22	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	10.7	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	9.6	*	0.0	*	9.6	*

	TL COL FREQ		205		24		229	
	% TABLE		89.52		10.48			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 12 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 4.98

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 25.3902 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.0131

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.02203
ROW	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
COLUMN	COLUMN	0.02463
	ROW	0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 156. WERE YOUR MOST PRESSING QUESTIONS ABOUT SEMINARS WITH NATIONAL
LECTURERS ANSWERED DURING THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		TOTALS	
	1	2	

1	CELL FREQ *	74	9
	% ROW *	89.2	10.8
	% COL *	38.1	36.0
	% TABLE *	33.8	4.1

2	CELL FREQ *	41	9
	% ROW *	82.0	18.0
	% COL *	21.1	36.0
	% TABLE *	18.7	4.1

3	CELL FREQ *	69	4
	% ROW *	94.5	5.5
	% COL *	35.6	16.0
	% TABLE *	31.5	1.8

4	CELL FREQ *	10	3
	% ROW *	76.9	23.1
	% COL *	5.2	12.0
	% TABLE *	4.6	1.4

	TL COL FREQ	194	25
	% TABLE	88.58	11.42

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 22 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 9.13

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 6.4625 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.0912

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.00000

CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.00000
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

TABLE 20A

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=OKLAND; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 156. WERE YOUR MOST PRESSING QUESTIONS ABOUT SEMINARS WITH NATIONAL
LECTURERS ANSWERED DURING THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

TOTALS

		1	2	
	CELL FREQ	1	1	2
1	% ROW	50.0	50.0	
	% COL	0.5	3.8	
	% TABLE	0.4	0.4	0.9
	CELL FREQ	19	7	26
2	% ROW	73.1	26.9	
	% COL	9.3	26.9	
	% TABLE	6.3	3.0	11.3
	CELL FREQ	14	1	15
3	% ROW	93.3	6.7	
	% COL	6.9	3.8	
	% TABLE	6.1	0.4	6.5
	CELL FREQ	18	3	21
4	% ROW	85.7	14.3	
	% COL	8.8	11.5	
	% TABLE	7.8	1.3	9.1
	CELL FREQ	24	1	25
5	% ROW	96.0	4.0	
	% COL	11.8	3.8	
	% TABLE	10.4	0.4	10.9
	CELL FREQ	12	1	13
6	% ROW	92.3	7.7	
	% COL	5.9	3.8	
	% TABLE	5.2	0.4	5.7
	CELL FREQ	22	3	25
7	% ROW	88.0	12.0	
	% COL	10.8	11.5	
	% TABLE	9.6	1.3	10.9

TABLE 20B

8	CELL FREQ	*	15	*	3	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	83.3	*	16.7	*		*
	% COL	*	7.4	*	11.5	*		*
	% TABLE	*	6.5	*	1.3	*	7.8	*

9	CELL FREQ	*	22	*	1	*	23	*
	% ROW	*	95.7	*	4.3	*		*
	% COL	*	10.8	*	3.8	*		*
	% TABLE	*	9.6	*	0.4	*	10.0	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	4	*	0	*	4	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	2.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.7	*	0.0	*	1.7	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	17	*	2	*	19	*
	% ROW	*	89.5	*	10.5	*		*
	% COL	*	8.3	*	7.7	*		*
	% TABLE	*	7.4	*	0.9	*	8.3	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	15	*	3	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	83.3	*	16.7	*		*
	% COL	*	7.4	*	11.5	*		*
	% TABLE	*	6.5	*	1.3	*	7.8	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	21	*	0	*	21	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	10.3	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	9.1	*	0.0	*	9.1	*

	TL COL FRQ		204		26		230	
	% TABLE		88.70		11.30			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 11 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 4.56

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 16.6724 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.1623

		SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.02174
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA	
ROW	COLUMN	0.02451	
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000	

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 15C. WERE YOUR MOST PRESSING QUESTIONS ABOUT PRACTICUMS ANSWERED DURING
THE SUMMER INSTITUTE,
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		TOTALS			
		1	2		
1	CELL FREQ	* 80	* 3	* 83	*
	% ROW	* 96.4	* 3.6	*	
	% COL	* 38.5	* 30.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 36.7	* 1.4	* 38.1	*
2	CELL FREQ	* 48	* 1	* 49	*
	% ROW	* 98.0	* 2.0	*	
	% COL	* 23.1	* 10.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 22.0	* 0.5	* 22.5	*
3	CELL FREQ	* 69	* 4	* 73	*
	% ROW	* 94.5	* 5.5	*	
	% COL	* 33.2	* 40.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 31.7	* 1.8	* 33.5	*
4	CELL FREQ	* 11	* 2	* 13	*
	% ROW	* 84.6	* 15.4	*	
	% COL	* 5.3	* 20.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 5.0	* 0.9	* 6.0	*
TL COL FREQ		208	10	218	
% TABLE		95.41	4.59		

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 23 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 9.54

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 4.5010 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.2122

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.00690

CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.00741
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

TABLE 21A

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BRROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 150% WERE YOUR MOST PRESSING QUESTIONS ABOUT PRACTICUMS ANSWERED DURING
THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

					TOTALS		
					1	2	
*****					*****		
1	CELL FREQ	*	2	*	0	*	2 *
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*	
	% COL	*	0.9	*	0.0	*	
	% TABLE	*	0.9	*	0.0	*	0.9 *
*****					*****		
2	CELL FREQ	*	23	*	3	*	26 *
	% ROW	*	88.5	*	11.5	*	
	% COL	*	10.5	*	33.3	*	
	% TABLE	*	10.1	*	1.3	*	11.4 *
*****					*****		
3	CELL FREQ	*	14	*	0	*	14 *
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*	
	% COL	*	6.4	*	0.0	*	
	% TABLE	*	6.1	*	0.0	*	6.1 *
*****					*****		
4	CELL FREQ	*	21	*	1	*	22 *
	% ROW	*	95.5	*	4.5	*	
	% COL	*	9.6	*	11.1	*	
	% TABLE	*	9.2	*	0.4	*	9.6 *
*****					*****		
5	CELL FREQ	*	25	*	0	*	25 *
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*	
	% COL	*	11.4	*	0.0	*	
	% TABLE	*	11.0	*	0.0	*	11.0 *
*****					*****		
6	CELL FREQ	*	12	*	1	*	13 *
	% ROW	*	92.3	*	7.7	*	
	% COL	*	5.5	*	11.1	*	
	% TABLE	*	5.3	*	0.4	*	5.7 *
*****					*****		
7	CELL FREQ	*	22	*	1	*	23 *
	% ROW	*	95.7	*	4.3	*	
	% COL	*	10.0	*	11.1	*	
	% TABLE	*	9.6	*	0.4	*	10.1 *
*****					*****		

TABLE 21B

8	CELL FREQ	*	18	*	0	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	8.2	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	7.9	*	0.0	*	7.9	*

9	CELL FREQ	*	23	*	0	*	23	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	10.5	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	10.1	*	0.0	*	10.1	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	4	*	0	*	4	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	1.8	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.8	*	0.0	*	1.8	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	16	*	3	*	19	*
	% ROW	*	84.2	*	15.8	*		*
	% COL	*	7.3	*	33.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	7.0	*	1.3	*	8.3	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	18	*	0	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	8.2	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	7.9	*	0.0	*	7.9	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	21	*	0	*	21	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	9.6	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	9.2	*	0.0	*	9.2	*

	TL COL FREQ		219		9		228	
	% TABLE		96.05		3.95			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 13 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 5.39

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 16.6272 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.1642

	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :		0.00948
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA	
ROW	COLUMN	0.00990	
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000	

TABLE 22A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 16. OVERALL, WHICH SESSIONS DID YOU ENJOY MOST.
1 = GENERAL SESSIONS.
2 = CONCURRENT SESSIONS.
3 = BOTH GENERAL AND CONCURRENT SESSIONS EQUALLY WELL.

	1	2	3	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	21	12	49	82
% ROW	25.6	14.6	59.8	*
% COL	52.5	24.0	39.2	*
% TABLE	9.8	5.6	22.8	38.1
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	7	19	21	47
% ROW	14.9	40.4	44.7	*
% COL	17.5	38.0	16.8	*
% TABLE	3.3	8.8	9.8	21.9
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	12	16	44	72
% ROW	16.7	22.2	61.1	*
% COL	30.0	32.0	35.2	*
% TABLE	5.6	7.4	20.5	33.5
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	0	3	11	14
% ROW	0.0	21.4	78.6	*
% COL	0.0	6.0	8.8	*
% TABLE	0.0	1.4	5.1	6.5
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	40	50	125	215
% TABLE	18.60	23.26	58.14	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 26 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 10.79

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 16.5085 ; DF = 6 ; P = 0.0113

CRITERION PREDICTOR LAMBDA : 0.03139
ROW COLUMN LAMBDA : 0.05263
COLUMN ROW LAMBDA : 0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 16. OVERALL, WHICH SESSIONS DID YOU ENJOY MOST.
1 = GENERAL SESSIONS.
2 = CONCURRENT SESSIONS.
3 = BOTH GENERAL AND CONCURRENT SESSIONS EQUALLY WELL.

		1	2	3	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	0	0	2	2
1	% ROW	0.0	0.0	100.0	
	% COL	0.0	0.0	1.5	
	% TABLE	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.9

	CELL FREQ	4	6	14	24
2	% ROW	16.7	25.0	58.3	
	% COL	9.5	11.1	10.7	
	% TABLE	1.8	2.6	6.2	10.6

	CELL FREQ	2	1	12	15
3	% ROW	13.3	6.7	80.0	
	% COL	4.8	1.9	9.2	
	% TABLE	0.9	0.4	5.3	6.6

	CELL FREQ	7	4	10	21
4	% ROW	33.3	19.0	47.6	
	% COL	16.7	7.4	7.6	
	% TABLE	3.1	1.8	4.4	9.3

	CELL FREQ	8	4	12	24
5	% ROW	33.3	16.7	50.0	
	% COL	19.0	7.4	9.2	
	% TABLE	3.5	1.8	5.3	10.6

	CELL FREQ	4	4	5	13
6	% ROW	30.8	30.8	38.5	
	% COL	9.5	7.4	3.8	
	% TABLE	1.8	1.8	2.2	5.7

	CELL FREQ	1	12	13	26
7	% ROW	3.8	46.2	50.0	
	% COL	2.4	22.2	9.9	
	% TABLE	0.4	5.3	5.7	11.5

TABLE 22B

8	CELL FREQ	*	2	*	5	*	11	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	11.1	*	27.8	*	61.1	*		*
	% COL	*	4.8	*	9.3	*	8.4	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.9	*	2.2	*	4.8	*	7.9	*

9	CELL FREQ	*	3	*	1	*	18	*	22	*
	% ROW	*	13.6	*	4.5	*	81.8	*		*
	% COL	*	7.1	*	1.9	*	13.7	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.3	*	0.4	*	7.9	*	9.7	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	1	*	0	*	3	*	4	*
	% ROW	*	25.0	*	0.0	*	75.0	*		*
	% COL	*	2.4	*	0.0	*	2.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.4	*	0.0	*	1.3	*	1.8	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	2	*	8	*	7	*	17	*
	% ROW	*	11.8	*	47.1	*	41.2	*		*
	% COL	*	4.8	*	14.8	*	5.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.9	*	3.5	*	3.1	*	7.5	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	5	*	5	*	8	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	27.8	*	27.8	*	44.4	*		*
	% COL	*	11.9	*	9.3	*	6.1	*		*
	% TABLE	*	2.2	*	2.2	*	3.5	*	7.9	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	3	*	4	*	16	*	23	*
	% ROW	*	13.0	*	17.4	*	69.6	*		*
	% COL	*	7.1	*	7.4	*	12.2	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.3	*	1.8	*	7.0	*	10.1	*

	TL COL FREQ		42		54		131		227	
	% TABLE		18.50		23.79		57.71			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 14 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 5.81

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 38.2558 ; DF = 24 ; P = 0.0326

	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.04377
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.05970
COLUMN	ROW	0.01042

TABLE 23A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE,
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 17A. DID YOU PERSONALLY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH (OR ASK
QUESTIONS OF) NATIONAL LECTURERS AND SESSION SPEAKERS.
(DURING GENERAL SESSIONS)
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	42	21	63
% ROW	66.7	33.3	*
% COL	44.2	28.8	*
% TABLE	25.0	12.5	37.5
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	23	18	41
% ROW	56.1	43.9	*
% COL	24.2	24.7	*
% TABLE	13.7	10.7	24.4
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	26	26	52
% ROW	50.0	50.0	*
% COL	27.4	35.6	*
% TABLE	15.5	15.5	31.0
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	4	8	12
% ROW	33.3	66.7	*
% COL	4.2	11.0	*
% TABLE	2.4	4.8	7.1
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	95	73	168
% TABLE	56.55	43.45	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 73 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 30.29

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 6.1679 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.1037

CRITERION

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.05056

PREDICTOR

LAMBDA

ROW

COLUMN

0.04762

COLUMN

ROW

0.05479

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 17A. DID YOU PERSONALLY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH (OR ASK
QUESTIONS OF) NATIONAL LECTURERS AND SESSION SPEAKERS.
(DURING GENERAL SESSIONS)
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	* 1	* 0	* 1 *
1	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 1.0	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 0.6	* 0.0	* 0.6 *

	CELL FREQ	* 13	* 9	* 22 *
2	% ROW	* 59.1	* 40.9	* *
	% COL	* 13.3	* 11.5	* *
	% TABLE	* 7.4	* 5.1	* 12.5 *

	CELL FREQ	* 9	* 4	* 13 *
3	% ROW	* 69.2	* 30.8	* *
	% COL	* 9.2	* 5.1	* *
	% TABLE	* 5.1	* 2.3	* 7.4 *

	CELL FREQ	* 11	* 5	* 16 *
4	% ROW	* 68.8	* 31.3	* *
	% COL	* 11.2	* 6.4	* *
	% TABLE	* 6.3	* 2.8	* 9.1 *

	CELL FREQ	* 13	* 6	* 19 *
5	% ROW	* 68.4	* 31.6	* *
	% COL	* 13.3	* 7.7	* *
	% TABLE	* 7.4	* 3.4	* 10.8 *

	CELL FREQ	* 2	* 5	* 7 *
6	% ROW	* 28.6	* 71.4	* *
	% COL	* 2.0	* 6.4	* *
	% TABLE	* 1.1	* 2.8	* 4.0 *

	CELL FREQ	* 10	* 11	* 21 *
7	% ROW	* 47.6	* 52.4	* *
	% COL	* 10.2	* 14.1	* *
	% TABLE	* 5.7	* 6.3	* 11.9 *

TABLE 23B

8	CELL FREQ	*	7	*	3	*	10	*
	% ROW	*	70.0	*	30.0	*		*
	% COL	*	7.1	*	3.8	*		*
	% TABLE	*	4.0	*	1.7	*	5.7	*

9	CELL FREQ	*	10	*	9	*	19	*
	% ROW	*	52.6	*	47.4	*		*
	% COL	*	10.2	*	11.5	*		*
	% TABLE	*	5.7	*	5.1	*	10.8	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	1	*	2	*	3	*
	% ROW	*	33.3	*	66.7	*		*
	% COL	*	1.0	*	2.6	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.6	*	1.1	*	1.7	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	6	*	8	*	14	*
	% ROW	*	42.9	*	57.1	*		*
	% COL	*	6.1	*	10.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	3.4	*	4.5	*	8.0	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	7	*	6	*	13	*
	% ROW	*	53.8	*	46.2	*		*
	% COL	*	7.1	*	7.7	*		*
	% TABLE	*	4.0	*	3.4	*	7.4	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	8	*	10	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	44.4	*	55.6	*		*
	% COL	*	8.2	*	12.8	*		*
	% TABLE	*	4.5	*	5.7	*	10.2	*

	TL COL FREQ		98		78		176	
	% TABLE		55.68		44.32			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 65 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 26.97

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 10.2430 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.5947

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :			0.04741
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA	
ROW	COLUMN	0.01299	
COLUMN	ROW	0.11538	

TABLE 24A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 17B. DID YOU PERSONALLY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH (OR ASK
QUESTIONS OF) NATIONAL LECTURERS AND SESSION SPEAKERS.
(DURING CONCURRENT SESSIONS)
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	75	2	77
% ROW	97.4	2.6	*
% COL	39.3	13.3	*
% TABLE	36.4	1.0	37.4
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	43	3	46
% ROW	93.5	6.5	*
% COL	22.5	20.0	*
% TABLE	20.9	1.5	22.3
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	63	7	70
% ROW	90.0	10.0	*
% COL	33.0	46.7	*
% TABLE	30.6	3.4	34.0
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	10	3	13
% ROW	76.9	23.1	*
% COL	5.2	20.0	*
% TABLE	4.9	1.5	6.3
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	191	15	206
% TABLE	92.72	7.28	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 35 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 14.52

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 8.1121 , DF = 3 , P = 0.0438

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA:	0.03472
PREDICTOR	LAMBDA	
ROW	COLUMN	0.03876
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 17B. DID YOU PERSONALLY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH (OR ASK
QUESTIONS OF) NATIONAL LECTURERS AND SESSION SPEAKERS.
(DURING CONCURRENT SESSIONS)
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	* 2	* 0	* 2 *
1	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 1.0	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 0.9	* 0.0	* 0.9 *

	CELL FREQ	* 23	* 2	* 25 *
2	% ROW	* 92.0	* 8.0	* *
	% COL	* 11.4	* 12.5	* *
	% TABLE	* 10.6	* 0.9	* 11.5 *

	CELL FREQ	* 12	* 2	* 14 *
3	% ROW	* 85.7	* 14.3	* *
	% COL	* 6.0	* 12.5	* *
	% TABLE	* 5.5	* 0.9	* 6.5 *

	CELL FREQ	* 19	* 2	* 21 *
4	% ROW	* 90.5	* 9.5	* *
	% COL	* 9.5	* 12.5	* *
	% TABLE	* 8.8	* 0.9	* 9.7 *

	CELL FREQ	* 23	* 1	* 24 *
5	% ROW	* 95.8	* 4.2	* *
	% COL	* 11.4	* 6.3	* *
	% TABLE	* 10.6	* 0.5	* 11.1 *

	CELL FREQ	* 12	* 0	* 12 *
6	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 6.0	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 5.5	* 0.0	* 5.5 *

	CELL FREQ	* 23	* 1	* 24 *
7	% ROW	* 95.8	* 4.2	* *
	% COL	* 11.4	* 6.3	* *
	% TABLE	* 10.6	* 0.5	* 11.1 *

TABLE 24B

8	CELL FREQ	* 17	* 0	* 17	*
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	*	
	% COL	* 8.5	* 0.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 7.8	* 0.0	* 7.8	*

9	CELL FREQ	* 19	* 3	* 22	*
	% ROW	* 86.4	* 13.6	*	
	% COL	* 9.5	* 18.8	*	
	% TABLE	* 8.8	* 1.4	* 10.1	*

10	CELL FREQ	* 4	* 0	* 4	*
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	*	
	% COL	* 2.0	* 0.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 1.8	* 0.0	* 1.8	*

11	CELL FREQ	* 12	* 3	* 15	*
	% ROW	* 80.0	* 20.0	*	
	% COL	* 6.0	* 18.8	*	
	% TABLE	* 5.5	* 1.4	* 6.9	*

12	CELL FREQ	* 15	* 2	* 17	*
	% ROW	* 83.2	* 11.8	*	
	% COL	* 7.5	* 12.5	*	
	% TABLE	* 6.9	* 0.9	* 7.8	*

13	CELL FREQ	* 20	* 0	* 20	*
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	*	
	% COL	* 10.0	* 0.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 9.2	* 0.0	* 9.2	*

	TL COL FRQ	201	16	217	
	% TABLE	92.63	7.37	.	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 24 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 9.96

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 11.4821 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.4881

	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.00481
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.00521
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

TABLE 25A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 17C. DID YOU PERSONALLY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH (OR ASK
QUESTIONS OF) NATIONAL LECTURERS AND SESSION SPEAKERS.
(OUTSIDE SCHEDULED SESSIONS)
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	81	1	82
% ROW	98.8	1.2	
% COL	40.5	6.7	
% TABLE	37.7	0.5	38.1
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	42	7	49
% ROW	85.7	14.3	
% COL	21.0	46.7	
% TABLE	19.5	3.3	22.8
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	64	5	69
% ROW	92.8	7.2	
% COL	32.0	33.3	
% TABLE	29.8	2.3	32.1
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	13	2	15
% ROW	86.7	13.3	
% COL	6.5	13.3	
% TABLE	6.0	0.9	7.0
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL CPL FREQ	200	15	215
% TABLE	93.02	6.98	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 26 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 10.79

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 9.1629 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.0272

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.04054
ROW	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
COLUMN	COLUMN	0.04511
ROW	ROW	0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BRBWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 17C. DID YOU PERSONALLY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH (OR ASK
QUESTIONS OF) NATIONAL LECTURERS AND SESSION SPEAKERS.
(OUTSIDE SCHEDULED SESSIONS)
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	1	0	1
1	% ROW	100.0	0.0	
	% COL	0.5	0.0	
	% TABLE	0.4	0.0	0.4

	CELL FREQ	23	2	25
2	% ROW	92.0	8.0	
	% COL	11.0	12.5	
	% TABLE	10.2	0.9	11.1

	CELL FREQ	15	0	15
3	% ROW	100.0	0.0	
	% COL	7.1	0.0	
	% TABLE	6.6	0.0	6.6

	CELL FREQ	16	4	20
4	% ROW	80.0	20.0	
	% COL	7.6	25.0	
	% TABLE	7.1	1.8	8.8

	CELL FREQ	24	2	26
5	% ROW	92.3	7.7	
	% COL	11.4	12.5	
	% TABLE	10.6	0.9	11.5

	CELL FREQ	11	0	11
6	% ROW	100.0	0.0	
	% COL	5.2	0.0	
	% TABLE	4.9	0.0	4.9

	CELL FREQ	25	1	26
7	% ROW	96.2	3.8	
	% COL	11.9	6.3	
	% TABLE	11.1	0.4	11.5

TABLE 25B

```

8  CELL FREQ * 15 * 1 * 16 *
   % ROW * 93.8 * 6.3 *
   % COL * 7.1 * 6.3 *
   % TABLE * 6.6 * 0.4 * 7.1 *
*****
9  CELL FREQ * 21 * 1 * 22 *
   % ROW * 95.5 * 4.5 *
   % COL * 10.0 * 6.3 *
   % TABLE * 9.3 * 0.4 * 9.7 *
*****
10 CELL FREQ * 4 * 0 * 4 *
   % ROW * 100.0 * 0.0 *
   % COL * 1.9 * 0.0 *
   % TABLE * 1.8 * 0.0 * 1.8 *
*****
11 CELL FREQ * 15 * 3 * 18 *
   % ROW * 83.3 * 16.7 *
   % COL * 7.1 * 18.8 *
   % TABLE * 6.6 * 1.3 * 8.0 *
*****
12 CELL FREQ * 17 * 1 * 18 *
   % ROW * 94.4 * 5.6 *
   % COL * 8.1 * 6.3 *
   % TABLE * 7.5 * 0.4 * 8.0 *
*****
13 CELL FREQ * 23 * 1 * 24 *
   % ROW * 95.8 * 4.2 *
   % COL * 11.0 * 6.3 *
   % TABLE * 10.2 * 0.4 * 10.6 *
*****
   TL COL FREQ 210 16 226
   % TABLE 92.92 7.08

```

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 15 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 6.22

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 11.0169 , DF = 12 , P = 0.5275

	<u>SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :</u>	0.01389
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.01500
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

TABLE 26A

ROWS REPRESENT:

PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.COLUMNS REPRESENT: 18A. DID YOU PERSONALLY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH (OR ASK
QUESTIONS OF) PARTICIPANTS FROM OTHER CLUSTERS.
(DURING GENERAL SESSIONS)

1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	53	17	70
% ROW	75.7	24.3	*
% COL	39.8	37.0	*
% TABLE	29.6	9.5	39.1
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	29	11	40
% ROW	72.5	27.5	*
% COL	21.8	23.9	*
% TABLE	16.2	6.1	22.3
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	42	15	57
% ROW	73.7	26.3	*
% COL	31.6	32.6	*
% TABLE	23.5	8.4	31.8
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	9	3	12
% ROW	75.0	25.0	*
% COL	6.8	6.5	*
% TABLE	5.0	1.7	6.7
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	133	46	179
% TABLE	74.30	25.70	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 62 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 25.73

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 0.1556 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.9844

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.00000

CRITERION

PREDICTOR LAMBDA

ROW

COLUMN 0.00000

COLUMN

ROW 0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BR0WARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPT0N; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=L0NG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLAND0; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 18A. DID YOU PERSONALLY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH (OR ASK
QUESTIONS OF) PARTICIPANTS FROM OTHER CLUSTERS.
(DURING GENERAL SESSIONS)
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		TOTALS	
		1	2

	CELL FREQ	* 1	* 0
1	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0
	% COL	* 0.7	* 0.0
	% TABLE	* 0.5	* 0.5

	CELL FREQ	* 19	* 4
2	% ROW	* 82.6	* 17.4
	% COL	* 13.9	* 8.2
	% TABLE	* 10.2	* 2.2

	CELL FREQ	* 10	* 2
3	% ROW	* 83.3	* 16.7
	% COL	* 7.3	* 4.1
	% TABLE	* 5.4	* 1.1

	CELL FREQ	* 13	* 4
4	% ROW	* 76.5	* 23.5
	% COL	* 9.5	* 8.2
	% TABLE	* 7.0	* 2.2

	CELL FREQ	* 17	* 6
5	% ROW	* 73.9	* 26.1
	% COL	* 12.4	* 12.2
	% TABLE	* 9.1	* 3.2

	CELL FREQ	* 6	* 2
6	% ROW	* 75.0	* 25.0
	% COL	* 4.4	* 4.1
	% TABLE	* 3.2	* 1.1

	CELL FREQ	* 13	* 9
7	% ROW	* 59.1	* 40.9
	% COL	* 9.5	* 18.4
	% TABLE	* 7.0	* 4.8

TABLE 26B

```

      CELL FREQ *    10 *    2 *    12 *
8  % ROW      * 83.3 * 16.7 *
   % COL      *  7.3 *  4.1 *
   % TABLE   *  5.4 *  1.1 *  0.5 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *    17 *    3 *    20 *
9  % ROW      * 85.0 * 15.0 *
   % COL      * 12.4 *  6.1 *
   % TABLE   *  9.1 *  1.6 * 10.8 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *    3 *    1 *    4 *
10 % ROW      * 75.0 * 25.0 *
   % COL      *  2.2 *  2.0 *
   % TABLE   *  1.6 *  0.5 *  2.2 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *    8 *    4 *    12 *
11 % ROW      * 66.7 * 33.3 *
   % COL      *  5.8 *  8.2 *
   % TABLE   *  4.3 *  2.2 *  6.5 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *    11 *    3 *    14 *
12 % ROW      * 78.6 * 21.4 *
   % COL      *  8.0 *  6.1 *
   % TABLE   *  5.9 *  1.6 *  7.5 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *    9 *    9 *    18 *
13 % ROW      * 50.0 * 50.0 *
   % COL      *  6.6 * 18.4 *
   % TABLE   *  4.8 *  4.8 *  9.7 *
*****
      TL COL FRQ    137    49    186
      % TABLE    73.66   26.34

```

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 55 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 22.82

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 11.9466 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.4500

	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.02358
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.03067
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

TABLE 27A

ROWS REPRESENT:

PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 188. DID YOU PERSONALLY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH (OR ASK

QUESTIONS OF) PARTICIPANTS FROM OTHER CLUSTERS.
(DURING CONCURRENT SESSIONS)

1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	66	11	77
% ROW	85.7	14.3	*
% COL	37.1	44.0	*
% TABLE	32.5	5.4	37.9
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	42	5	47
% ROW	89.4	10.6	*
% COL	23.6	20.0	*
% TABLE	20.7	2.5	23.2
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	57	8	65
% ROW	87.7	12.3	*
% COL	32.0	32.0	*
% TABLE	28.1	3.9	32.0
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	13	1	14
% ROW	92.9	7.1	*
% COL	7.3	4.0	*
% TABLE	6.4	0.5	6.9
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	178	25	203
% TABLE	87.68	12.32	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 38 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 15.77

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 0.7461 , DF = 3 , P = 0.8623

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.00000
ROW	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
COLUMN	COLUMN	0.00000
ROW	ROW	0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 188. DID YOU PERSONALLY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH (OR ASK
QUESTIONS OF) PARTICIPANTS FROM OTHER CLUSTERS.
(DURING CONCURRENT SESSIONS)
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

					TOTALS		
					1	2	

	CELL FREQ	*	1	*	0	*	1 *
1	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*	
	% COL	*	0.5	*	0.0	*	
	% TABLE	*	0.5	*	0.0	*	0.5 *

	CELL FREQ	*	20	*	4	*	24 *
2	% ROW	*	83.3	*	16.7	*	
	% COL	*	10.8	*	14.8	*	
	% TABLE	*	9.4	*	1.9	*	11.3 *

	CELL FREQ	*	10	*	3	*	13 *
3	% ROW	*	76.9	*	23.1	*	
	% COL	*	5.4	*	11.1	*	
	% TABLE	*	4.7	*	1.4	*	6.1 *

	CELL FREQ	*	19	*	1	*	20 *
4	% ROW	*	95.0	*	5.0	*	
	% COL	*	10.3	*	3.7	*	
	% TABLE	*	9.0	*	0.5	*	9.4 *

	CELL FREQ	*	24	*	1	*	25 *
5	% ROW	*	96.0	*	4.0	*	
	% COL	*	13.0	*	3.7	*	
	% TABLE	*	11.3	*	0.5	*	11.8 *

	CELL FREQ	*	9	*	3	*	12 *
6	% ROW	*	75.0	*	25.0	*	
	% COL	*	4.9	*	11.1	*	
	% TABLE	*	4.2	*	1.4	*	5.7 *

	CELL FREQ	*	19	*	5	*	24 *
7	% ROW	*	79.2	*	20.8	*	
	% COL	*	10.3	*	18.5	*	
	% TABLE	*	9.0	*	2.4	*	11.3 *

TABLE 27B

8	CELL FREQ	*	14	*	1	*	15	*
	% ROW	*	93.3	*	6.7	*		*
	% COL	*	7.6	*	3.7	*		*
	% TABLE	*	6.6	*	0.5	*	7.1	*

9	CELL FREQ	*	20	*	2	*	22	*
	% ROW	*	90.9	*	9.1	*		*
	% COL	*	10.8	*	7.4	*		*
	% TABLE	*	9.4	*	0.9	*	10.4	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	4	*	0	*	4	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	2.2	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.9	*	0.0	*	1.9	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	14	*	2	*	16	*
	% ROW	*	87.5	*	12.5	*		*
	% COL	*	7.6	*	7.4	*		*
	% TABLE	*	6.6	*	0.9	*	7.5	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	16	*	0	*	16	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	8.6	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	7.5	*	0.0	*	7.5	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	15	*	5	*	20	*
	% ROW	*	75.0	*	25.0	*		*
	% COL	*	8.1	*	18.5	*		*
	% TABLE	*	7.1	*	2.4	*	9.4	*

	TL COL FREQ		185		27		212	
	% TABLE		87.26		12.74			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 29 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 12.03

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 13.9506 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.3039

	<u>SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :</u>	0.01869
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.02139
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

TABLE 28A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE,
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 18C. DID YOU PERSONALLY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH (OR ASK
QUESTIONS OF) PARTICIPANTS FROM OTHER CLUSTERS.
(OUTSIDE SCHEDULED SESSIONS)
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	82	0	82
% ROW	100.0	0.0	*
% COL	38.3	0.0	*
% TABLE	37.6	0.0	37.6
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	48	1	49
% ROW	98.0	2.0	*
% COL	22.4	25.0	*
% TABLE	22.0	0.5	22.5
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	71	2	73
% ROW	97.3	2.7	*
% COL	33.2	50.0	*
% TABLE	32.6	0.9	33.5
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	13	1	14
% ROW	92.9	7.1	*
% COL	6.1	25.0	*
% TABLE	6.0	0.5	6.4
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	214	4	218
% TABLE	98.17	1.83	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 23 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 9.54

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 4.0660 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.2544

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.01429
PREDICTOR	LAMBDA	
ROW	COLUMN	0.01471
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 1&C. DID YOU PERSONALLY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH (OR ASK
QUESTIONS OF) PARTICIPANTS FROM OTHER CLUSTERS.
(OUTSIDE SCHEDULED SESSIONS)
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	TOTALS		
	1	2	

1 CELL FREQ	2	0	2
% ROW	100.0	0.0	
% COL	0.9	0.0	
% TABLE	0.9	0.0	0.9

2 CELL FREQ	25	1	26
% ROW	96.2	3.8	
% COL	11.1	20.0	
% TABLE	10.9	0.4	11.3

3 CELL FREQ	14	1	15
% ROW	93.3	6.7	
% COL	6.2	20.0	
% TABLE	6.1	0.4	6.5

4 CELL FREQ	21	1	22
% ROW	95.5	4.5	
% COL	9.3	20.0	
% TABLE	9.1	0.4	9.6

5 CELL FREQ	23	1	24
% ROW	95.8	4.2	
% COL	10.2	20.0	
% TABLE	10.0	0.4	10.4

6 CELL FREQ	12	1	13
% ROW	92.3	7.7	
% COL	5.3	20.0	
% TABLE	5.2	0.4	5.7

7 CELL FREQ	25	0	25
% ROW	100.0	0.0	
% COL	11.1	0.0	
% TABLE	10.9	0.0	10.9

TABLE 288

8	CELL FREQ	* 17	* 0	* 17	*
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	*	
	% COL	* 7.6	* 0.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 7.4	* 0.0	* 7.4	*

9	CELL FREQ	* 22	* 0	* 22	*
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	*	
	% COL	* 9.8	* 0.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 9.6	* 0.0	* 9.6	*

10	CELL FREQ	* 4	* 0	* 4	*
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	*	
	% COL	* 1.8	* 0.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 1.7	* 0.0	* 1.7	*

11	CELL FREQ	* 18	* 0	* 18	*
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	*	
	% COL	* 8.0	* 0.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 7.8	* 0.0	* 7.8	*

12	CELL FREQ	* 18	* 0	* 18	*
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	*	
	% COL	* 8.0	* 0.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 7.8	* 0.0	* 7.8	*

13	CELL FREQ	* 24	* 0	* 24	*
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	*	
	% COL	* 10.7	* 0.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 10.4	* 0.0	* 10.4	*

	TL COL FRQ	225	5	230	
	% TABLE	97.83	2.1,		

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 11 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 4.56

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 7.5460 , DF = 12 , P = 0.8195

		SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :		0.00000
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA		
ROW	COLUMN	0.00000		
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000		

TABLE 29

ROWS REPRESENT: 1973 RESPONSE PATTERN (OVERALL).

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 22A. WERE FACILITIES FOR GENERAL SESSIONS ADEQUATE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	216	21	237
% ROW	91.1	8.9	*
% COL	100.0	100.0	*
% TABLE	91.1	8.9	100.0
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	216	21	237
% TABLE	91.14	8.86	
TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241	NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 4	PERCENT OF TOTAL: 1.66	

TABLE 29A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION, 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE,
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION, 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 22A. WERE FACILITIES FOR GENERAL SESSIONS ADEQUATE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
1			
CELL FREQ	82	3	85
% ROW	96.5	3.5	*
% COL	40.4	15.8	*
% TABLE	36.9	1.4	38.3
*****	*****	*****	*****
2			
CELL FREQ	45	5	50
% ROW	90.0	10.0	*
% COL	22.2	26.3	*
% TABLE	20.3	2.3	22.5
*****	*****	*****	*****
3			
CELL FREQ	63	9	72
% ROW	87.5	12.5	*
% COL	31.0	47.4	*
% TABLE	28.4	4.1	32.4
*****	*****	*****	*****
4			
CELL FREQ	13	2	15
% ROW	86.7	13.3	*
% COL	6.4	10.5	*
% TABLE	5.9	0.9	6.8
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	203	19	222
% TABLE	91.44	8.56	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 19 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 7.88

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 4.7460 , DF = 3 , P = 0.1914

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.03846
ROW	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
COLUMN	COLUMN	0.04380
ROW	ROW	0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 22A. WERE FACILITIES FOR GENERAL SESSIONS ADEQUATE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

1	CELL FREQ	* 2	* 0	* 2 *
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 0.9	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 0.9	* 0.0	* 0.9 *

2	CELL FREQ	* 23	* 2	* 25 *
	% ROW	* 92.0	* 8.0	* *
	% COL	* 10.8	* 9.5	* *
	% TABLE	* 9.9	* 0.9	* 10.7 *

3	CELL FREQ	* 12	* 3	* 15 *
	% ROW	* 80.0	* 20.0	* *
	% COL	* 5.7	* 14.3	* *
	% TABLE	* 5.2	* 1.3	* 6.4 *

4	CELL FREQ	* 21	* 1	* 22 *
	% ROW	* 95.5	* 4.5	* *
	% COL	* 9.9	* 4.8	* *
	% TABLE	* 9.0	* 0.4	* 9.4 *

5	CELL FREQ	* 24	* 2	* 26 *
	% ROW	* 92.3	* 7.7	* *
	% COL	* 11.3	* 9.5	* *
	% TABLE	* 10.3	* 0.9	* 11.2 *

6	CELL FREQ	* 13	* 1	* 14 *
	% ROW	* 92.9	* 7.1	* *
	% COL	* 6.1	* 4.8	* *
	% TABLE	* 5.6	* 0.4	* 6.0 *

7	CELL FREQ	* 24	* 2	* 26 *
	% ROW	* 92.3	* 7.7	* *
	% COL	* 11.3	* 9.5	* *
	% TABLE	* 10.3	* 0.9	* 11.2 *

TABLE 29B

8	CELL FREQ	*	17	*	1	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	94.4	*	5.6	*		*
	% COL	*	8.0	*	4.8	*		*
	% TABLE	*	7.3	*	0.4	*	7.7	*

9	CELL FREQ	*	21	*	1	*	22	*
	% ROW	*	95.5	*	4.5	*		*
	% COL	*	9.9	*	4.8	*		*
	% TABLE	*	9.0	*	0.4	*	9.4	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	4	*	0	*	4	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	1.9	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.7	*	0.0	*	1.7	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	14	*	4	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	77.8	*	22.2	*		*
	% COL	*	6.6	*	19.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	6.0	*	1.7	*	7.7	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	15	*	3	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	83.3	*	16.7	*		*
	% COL	*	7.1	*	14.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	6.4	*	1.3	*	7.7	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	22	*	1	*	23	*
	% ROW	*	95.7	*	4.3	*		*
	% COL	*	10.4	*	4.8	*		*
	% TABLE	*	9.4	*	0.4	*	9.9	*

	TL COL FRQ		212		21		233	
	% TABLE		90.99		9.01			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 8 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 3.32

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 10.0633 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.6104

	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.00877
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.00966
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

TABLE 30

ROWS REPRESENT: 1973 RESPONSE PATTERN (OVERALL)•

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 228. WERE FACILITIES FOR CONCURRENT SESSIONS ADEQUATE.

1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	* 211	* 23	* 234
% ROW	* 90.2	* 9.8	*
% COL	* 100.0	* 100.0	*
% TABLE	* 90.2	* 9.8	* 100.0
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	211	23	234
% TABLE	90.17	9.83	
TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE:	241	NUMBER NOT RESPONDING:	7
		PERCENT OF TOTAL:	2.90

TABLE 30A

ROWS REPRESENT:

PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.COLUMNS REPRESENT: 228. WERE FACILITIES FOR CONCURRENT SESSIONS ADEQUATE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	79	5	84
% ROW	94.0	6.0	
% COL	39.9	22.7	
% TABLE	35.9	2.3	38.2
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	42	7	49
% ROW	85.7	14.3	
% COL	21.2	31.8	
% TABLE	19.1	3.2	22.3
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	62	10	72
% ROW	86.1	13.9	
% COL	31.3	45.5	
% TABLE	28.2	4.5	32.7
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	15	0	15
% ROW	100.0	0.0	
% COL	7.6	0.0	
% TABLE	6.8	0.0	6.8
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	198	22	220
% TABLE	90.00	10.00	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 21 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 8.71

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 5.4056 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.1444.

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.03165

CRITERION

PREDICTOR

LAMBDA

ROW

COLUMN

0.03676

COLUMN

ROW

0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 22B. WERE FACILITIES FOR CONCURRENT SESSIONS ADEQUATE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

1	CELL FREQ	* 2	* 0	* 2 *
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 1.0	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 0.9	* 0.0	* 0.9 *

2	CELL FREQ	* 21	* 5	* 26 *
	% ROW	* 80.8	* 19.2	* *
	% COL	* 10.1	* 21.7	* *
	% TABLE	* 9.1	* 2.2	* 11.3 *

3	CELL FREQ	* 13	* 2	* 15 *
	% ROW	* 86.7	* 13.3	* *
	% COL	* 6.3	* 8.7	* *
	% TABLE	* 5.7	* 0.9	* 6.5 *

4	CELL FREQ	* 18	* 3	* 21 *
	% ROW	* 85.7	* 14.3	* *
	% COL	* 8.7	* 13.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 7.8	* 1.3	* 9.1 *

5	CELL FREQ	* 25	* 1	* 26 *
	% ROW	* 96.2	* 3.8	* *
	% COL	* 12.1	* 4.3	* *
	% TABLE	* 10.9	* 0.4	* 11.3 *

6	CELL FREQ	* 14	* 0	* 14 *
	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 6.8	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 6.1	* 0.0	* 6.1 *

7	CELL FREQ	* 21	* 4	* 25 *
	% ROW	* 84.0	* 16.0	* *
	% COL	* 10.1	* 17.4	* *
	% TABLE	* 9.1	* 1.7	* 10.9 *

TABLE 30B

8	CELL FREQ	*	15	*	2	*	17	*
	% ROW	*	88.2	*	11.8	*		*
	% COL	*	7.2	*	8.7	*		*
	% TABLE	*	6.5	*	0.9	*	7.4	*

	CELL FREQ	*	21	*	1	*	22	*
9	% ROW	*	95.5	*	4.5	*		*
	% COL	*	10.1	*	4.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	9.1	*	0.4	*	9.6	*

	CELL FREQ	*	4	*	0	*	4	*
10	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	1.9	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.7	*	0.0	*	1.7	*

	CELL FREQ	*	14	*	4	*	18	*
11	% ROW	*	77.8	*	22.2	*		*
	% COL	*	6.8	*	17.4	*		*
	% TABLE	*	6.1	*	1.7	*	7.8	*

	CELL FREQ	*	16	*	1	*	17	*
12	% ROW	*	94.1	*	5.9	*		*
	% COL	*	7.7	*	4.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	7.0	*	0.4	*	7.4	*

	CELL FREQ	*	23	*	0	*	23	*
13	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	11.1	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	10.0	*	0.0	*	10.0	*

	TL COL FREQ		207		23		230	
	% TABLE		90.00		10.00			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 11 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 4.56

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 14.0411 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.2981

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.01762

CRITERION

PREDICTOR

LAMBDA

ROW

COLUMN

0.01361

COLUMN

ROW

0.00000

TABLE 31

ROWS REPRESENT: 1973 RESPONSE PATTERN (OVERALL).

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 22C. WERE FACILITIES FOR COFFEE BREAKS ADEQUATE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	* 184 *	* 49 *	* 233 *
% ROW	* 79.0 *	* 21.0 *	
% COL	* 100.0 *	* 100.0 *	
% TABLE	* 79.0 *	* 21.0 *	* 100.0 *
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL CGL FREQ	184	49	233
% TABLE	73.97	21.03	
TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241	NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 8	PERCENT OF TOTAL: 3.32	

TABLE 31A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION, 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE,
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION, 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 22C. WERE FACILITIES FOR COFFEE BREAKS ADEQUATE.
1 = YES, 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	67	17	84
% ROW	79.8	20.2	*
% COL	39.0	36.2	*
% TABLE	30.6	7.8	38.4
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	44	5	49
% ROW	89.8	10.2	*
% COL	25.6	10.5	*
% TABLE	20.1	2.3	22.4
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	51	21	72
% ROW	70.8	29.2	*
% COL	29.7	44.7	*
% TABLE	23.3	9.6	32.9
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	10	4	14
% ROW	71.4	28.6	*
% COL	5.8	8.5	*
% TABLE	4.6	1.8	6.4
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	172	47	219
% TABLE	78.54	21.46	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 22 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 9.13

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 6.7147 , DF = 3 , P = 0.0816

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.02198
ROW	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
COLUMN	COLUMN	0.02963
ROW	ROW	0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 22C. WERE FACILITIES FOR COFFEE BREAKS ADEQUATE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	1	0	1
1	% ROW	100.0	0.0	
	% COL	0.6	0.0	
	% TABLE	0.4	0.0	0.4

	CELL FREQ	24	2	26
2	% ROW	92.3	7.7	
	% COL	13.3	4.1	
	% TABLE	10.5	0.9	11.4

	CELL FREQ	11	4	15
3	% ROW	73.3	26.7	
	% COL	6.1	8.2	
	% TABLE	4.8	1.7	6.6

	CELL FREQ	16	5	21
4	% ROW	76.2	23.8	
	% COL	8.9	10.2	
	% TABLE	7.0	2.2	9.2

	CELL FREQ	24	1	25
5	% ROW	96.0	4.0	
	% COL	13.3	2.0	
	% TABLE	10.5	0.4	10.9

	CELL FREQ	10	4	14
6	% ROW	71.4	28.6	
	% COL	5.6	8.2	
	% TABLE	4.4	1.7	6.1

	CELL FREQ	18	6	24
7	% ROW	75.0	25.0	
	% COL	10.0	12.2	
	% TABLE	7.9	2.6	10.5

TABLE 31B

8	CELL FREQ	*	16	*	2	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	88.9	*	11.1	*		*
	% COL	*	8.9	*	4.1	*		*
	% TABLE	*	7.0	*	0.9	*	7.9	*

	CELL FREQ	*	15	*	7	*	22	*
9	% ROW	*	68.2	*	31.8	*		*
	% COL	*	8.3	*	14.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	6.6	*	3.1	*	9.6	*

	CELL FREQ	*	4	*	0	*	4	*
10	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	2.2	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.7	*	0.0	*	1.7	*

	CELL FREQ	*	14	*	4	*	18	*
11	% ROW	*	77.8	*	22.2	*		*
	% COL	*	7.8	*	8.2	*		*
	% TABLE	*	6.1	*	1.7	*	7.9	*

	CELL FREQ	*	12	*	6	*	18	*
12	% ROW	*	66.7	*	33.3	*		*
	% COL	*	6.7	*	12.2	*		*
	% TABLE	*	5.2	*	2.6	*	7.9	*

	CELL FREQ	*	15	*	8	*	23	*
13	% ROW	*	65.2	*	34.8	*		*
	% COL	*	7.3	*	16.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	6.6	*	3.5	*	10.0	*

	TL COL FREQ		180		49		229	
	% TABLE		78.60		21.40			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 12 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 4.98

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 16.2325 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.1808

	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.02381
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.02956
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

TABLE 32

ROWS REPRESENT: 1973 RESPONSE PATTERN (OVERALL)*

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 22D. WERE FACILITIES FOR COCKTAILS ADEQUATE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	* 206	* 10	* 216
% ROW	* 95.4	* 4.6	*
% COL	* 100.0	* 100.0	*
% TABLE	* 95.4	* 4.6	* 100.0
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	206	10	216
% TABLE	95.37	4.63	
TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE:	241	NUMBER NOT RESPONDING:	25
		PERCENT OF TOTAL:	10.37

TABLE 32A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 220. WERE FACILITIES FOR COCKTAILS ADEQUATE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	79	3	82
% ROW	96.3	3.7	*
% COL	40.3	37.5	*
% TABLE	38.7	1.5	40.2
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	43	1	44
% ROW	97.7	2.3	*
% COL	21.9	12.5	*
% TABLE	21.1	0.5	21.6
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	62	4	66
% ROW	93.9	6.1	*
% COL	31.6	50.0	*
% TABLE	30.4	2.0	32.4
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	12	0	12
% ROW	100.0	0.0	*
% COL	6.1	0.0	*
% TABLE	5.9	0.0	5.9
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL CHL FREQ	196	8	204
% TABLE	96.08	3.92	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 37 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 15.35

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 1.6238 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.6540

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.00769
ROW	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
COLUMN	COLUMN	0.00820
ROW	ROW	0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BR0WARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 22D. WERE FACILITIES FOR COCKTAILS ADEQUATE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	* 1	* 0	* 1 *
1	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 0.5	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 0.5	* 0.0	* 0.5 *

	CELL FREQ	* 20	* 2	* 22 *
2	% ROW	* 90.9	* 9.1	* *
	% COL	* 9.9	* 20.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 9.4	* 0.9	* 10.4 *

	CELL FREQ	* 12	* 0	* 12 *
3	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 5.9	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 5.7	* 0.0	* 5.7 *

	CELL FREQ	* 20	* 1	* 21 *
4	% ROW	* 95.2	* 4.8	* *
	% COL	* 9.9	* 10.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 9.4	* 0.5	* 9.9 *

	CELL FREQ	* 23	* 0	* 23 *
5	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	* *
	% COL	* 11.4	* 0.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 10.8	* 0.0	* 10.8 *

	CELL FREQ	* 11	* 2	* 13 *
6	% ROW	* 84.6	* 15.4	* *
	% COL	* 5.4	* 20.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 5.2	* 0.9	* 6.1 *

	CELL FREQ	* 23	* 1	* 24 *
7	% ROW	* 95.8	* 4.2	* *
	% COL	* 11.4	* 10.0	* *
	% TABLE	* 10.8	* 0.5	* 11.3 *

TABLE 32B

```

      CELL FREQ *   16 *    1 *   17 *
8  % ROW * 94.1 *   5.9 *
   % COL *   7.9 *  10.0 *
   % TABLE *   7.5 *   0.5 *   8.0 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *   20 *    0 *   20 *
9  % ROW * 100.0 *   0.0 *
   % COL *   9.9 *   0.0 *
   % TABLE *   9.4 *   0.0 *   9.4 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *    3 *    0 *    3 *
10 % ROW * 100.0 *   0.0 *
   % COL *    1.5 *   0.0 *
   % TABLE *    1.4 *   0.0 *   1.4 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *   15 *    3 *   18 *
11 % ROW * 83.3 *  16.7 *
   % COL *    7.4 *  30.0 *
   % TABLE *    7.1 *   1.4 *   8.5 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *   15 *    0 *   15 *
12 % ROW * 100.0 *   0.0 *
   % COL *    7.4 *   0.0 *
   % TABLE *    7.1 *   0.0 *   7.1 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *   23 *    0 *   23 *
13 % ROW * 100.0 *   0.0 *
   % COL *   11.4 *   0.0 *
   % TABLE *   10.8 *   0.0 *  10.8 *
*****
      TL COL FRQ   202    10    212
      % TABLE   95.28   4.72

```

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 29 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 12.03

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 14.8164 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.2516

		<u>SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :</u>	0.01010
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA	
ROW	COLUMN	0.01064	
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000	

TABLE 33

ROWS REPRESENT: 1973 RESPONSE PATTERN (OVERALL).

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 22E. WERE FACILITIES FOR MONDAY, FRIDAY EVENING BANQUETS ADEQUATE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	218	7	225
% ROW	96.9	3.1	*
% COL	100.0	100.0	*
% TABLE	96.9	3.1	100.0
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	218	7	225
% TABLE	96.89	3.11	
TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE:	241	NUMBER NOT RESPONDING:	16
		PERCENT OF TOTAL:	6.64

TABLE 33A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 22E. WERE FACILITIES FOR MONDAY, FRIDAY EVENING BANQUETS ADEQUATE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	80	3	83
% ROW	96.4	3.6	*
% COL	38.8	50.0	*
% TABLE	37.7	1.4	39.2
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	48	0	48
% ROW	100.0	0.0	*
% COL	23.3	0.0	22.6
% TABLE	22.6	0.0	*
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	65	3	68
% ROW	95.6	4.4	*
% COL	31.6	50.0	*
% TABLE	30.7	1.4	32.1
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	13	0	13
% ROW	100.0	0.0	*
% COL	6.3	0.0	6.1
% TABLE	6.1	0.0	*
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	206	6	212
% TABLE	97.17	2.83	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 29 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 12.03

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 2.5808 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.4609

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA:	0.00000
ROW	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
COLUMN	COLUMN	0.00000
ROW	ROW	0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 22E. WERE FACILITIES FOR MONDAY, FRIDAY EVENING BANQUETS ADEQUATE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		TOTALS	
		1	2

	CELL FREQ	1	0
1	% ROW	100.0	0.0
	% COL	0.5	0.0
	% TABLE	0.5	0.0

	CELL FREQ	25	1
2	% ROW	96.2	3.8
	% COL	11.7	14.3
	% TABLE	11.3	0.5

	CELL FREQ	12	0
3	% ROW	100.0	0.0
	% COL	5.6	0.0
	% TABLE	5.4	0.0

	CELL FREQ	22	0
4	% ROW	100.0	0.0
	% COL	10.3	0.0
	% TABLE	10.0	0.0

	CELL FREQ	25	0
5	% ROW	100.0	0.0
	% COL	11.7	0.0
	% TABLE	11.3	0.0

	CELL FREQ	11	2
6	% ROW	84.6	15.4
	% COL	5.1	28.6
	% TABLE	5.0	0.9

	CELL FREQ	22	2
7	% ROW	91.7	8.3
	% COL	10.3	28.6
	% TABLE	10.0	0.9

TABLE 33B

	CELL FREQ	*	17	*	0	*	17	*
8	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	7.9	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	7.7	*	0.0	*	7.7	*

	CELL FREQ	*	22	*	0	*	22	*
9	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	10.3	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	10.0	*	0.0	*	10.0	*

	CELL FREQ	*	3	*	0	*	3	*
10	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	1.4	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.4	*	0.0	*	1.4	*

	CELL FREQ	*	16	*	2	*	18	*
11	% ROW	*	88.9	*	11.1	*		*
	% COL	*	7.5	*	28.6	*		*
	% TABLE	*	7.2	*	0.9	*	8.1	*

	CELL FREQ	*	15	*	0	*	15	*
12	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	7.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	6.8	*	0.0	*	6.8	*

	CELL FREQ	*	23	*	0	*	23	*
13	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		*
	% COL	*	10.7	*	0.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	10.4	*	0.0	*	10.4	*

	TL COL FRQ		214		7		221	
	% TABLE		96.83		3.17			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 20 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 8.30

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 16.7364 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.1598

	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.00495
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.00513
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

TABLE 34A

R9WS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 2+ BY WHAT MEANS DID YOU TRAVEL TO THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.

1 = BY AIRPLANE
2 = BY AUTOMOBILE
3 = OTHER.

	1	2	3	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	33	47	3	83
% ROW	39.8	56.6	3.6	*
% COL	37.9	37.0	50.0	*
% TABLE	15.0	21.4	1.4	37.7
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	23	26	1	50
% ROW	46.0	52.0	2.0	*
% COL	26.4	20.5	16.7	*
% TABLE	10.5	11.8	0.5	22.7
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	28	43	1	72
% ROW	38.9	59.7	1.4	*
% COL	32.2	33.9	16.7	*
% TABLE	12.7	19.5	0.5	32.7
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	3	11	1	15
% ROW	20.0	73.3	6.7	*
% COL	3.4	8.7	16.7	*
% TABLE	1.4	5.0	0.5	6.8
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	87	127	6	220
% TABLE	39.55	57.73	2.73	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 21 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 8.71

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 4.6316 ; DF = 6 ; P = 0.5919

CRITERION	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.00000
PREDICTOR	LAMBDA	
ROW	COLUMN	0.00000
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 24. BY WHAT MEANS DID YOU TRAVEL TO THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = BY AIRPLANE
2 = BY AUTOMOBILE
3 = OTHER.

		1	2	3	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	0	2	0	2
1	% ROW	0.0	100.0	0.0	
	% COL	0.0	1.5	0.0	
	% TABLE	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.9

	CELL FREQ	23	2	0	25
2	% ROW	92.0	8.0	0.0	
	% COL	24.7	1.5	0.0	
	% TABLE	9.9	0.9	0.0	10.8

	CELL FREQ	4	7	4	15
3	% ROW	26.7	46.7	26.7	
	% COL	4.3	5.3	66.7	
	% TABLE	1.7	3.0	1.7	6.5

	CELL FREQ	0	22	0	22
4	% ROW	0.0	100.0	0.0	
	% COL	0.0	16.5	0.0	
	% TABLE	0.0	9.5	0.0	9.5

	CELL FREQ	1	24	0	25
5	% ROW	4.0	96.0	0.0	
	% COL	1.1	18.0	0.0	
	% TABLE	0.4	10.3	0.0	10.8

	CELL FREQ	12	2	0	14
6	% ROW	85.7	14.3	0.0	
	% COL	12.9	1.5	0.0	
	% TABLE	5.2	0.9	0.0	6.0

	CELL FREQ	2	24	0	26
7	% ROW	7.7	92.3	0.0	
	% COL	2.2	18.0	0.0	
	% TABLE	0.9	10.3	0.0	11.2

TABLE 34B

8	CELL FREQ	*	9	*	7	*	2	*	18	*
	% ROW	*	50.0	*	38.9	*	11.1	*		
	% COL	*	9.7	*	5.3	*	33.3	*		
	% TABLE	*	3.9	*	3.0	*	0.9	*	7.8	*

9	CELL FREQ	*	1	*	22	*	0	*	23	*
	% ROW	*	4.3	*	95.7	*	0.0	*		
	% COL	*	1.1	*	16.5	*	0.0	*		
	% TABLE	*	0.4	*	9.5	*	0.0	*	9.9	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	0	*	3	*	0	*	3	*
	% ROW	*	0.0	*	100.0	*	0.0	*		
	% COL	*	0.0	*	2.3	*	0.0	*		
	% TABLE	*	0.0	*	1.3	*	0.0	*	1.3	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	19	*	0	*	0	*	19	*
	% ROW	*	100.0	*	0.0	*	0.0	*		
	% COL	*	20.4	*	0.0	*	0.0	*		
	% TABLE	*	8.2	*	0.0	*	0.0	*	8.2	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	1	*	16	*	0	*	17	*
	% ROW	*	5.9	*	94.1	*	0.0	*		
	% COL	*	1.1	*	12.0	*	0.0	*		
	% TABLE	*	0.4	*	6.9	*	0.0	*	7.3	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	21	*	2	*	0	*	23	*
	% ROW	*	91.3	*	8.7	*	0.0	*		
	% COL	*	22.6	*	1.5	*	0.0	*		
	% TABLE	*	9.1	*	0.9	*	0.0	*	9.9	*

	TL COL FRQ		93		133		6		232	
	% TABLE		40.09		57.33		2.59			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 9 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 3.73

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 206.5722 ; DF = 24 ; P = 0.0000

		SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.31475
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA	
ROW	COLUMN		0.12136
COLUMN	ROW		0.71717

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 25. IN YOUR OPINION IS THERE ANY ACTIVITY OR SESSION THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN,
BUT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	* 25	* 52	* 77
1	% ROW	* 32.5	* 67.5	*
	% COL	* 31.3	* 44.4	*
	% TABLE	* 12.7	* 26.4	* 39.1

	CELL FREQ	* 18	* 24	* 42
2	% ROW	* 42.9	* 57.1	*
	% COL	* 22.5	* 29.5	*
	% TABLE	* 9.1	* 12.2	* 21.3

	CELL FREQ	* 27	* 38	* 65
3	% ROW	* 41.5	* 58.5	*
	% COL	* 33.8	* 32.5	*
	% TABLE	* 13.7	* 19.3	* 33.0

	CELL FREQ	* 10	* 3	* 13
4	% ROW	* 76.9	* 23.1	*
	% COL	* 12.5	* 2.6	*
	% TABLE	* 5.1	* 1.5	* 6.6

	TL COL FREQ	80	117	197
	% TABLE	40.61	59.39	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 44 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 18.26

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 9.3355 , DF = 3 , P = 0.0251

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.04500

CRITERION

PREDICTOR

LAMBDA

ROW

COLUMN

0.01667

COLUMN

ROW

0.08750

TABLE 35A

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BRDWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 25. IN YOUR OPINION IS THERE ANY ACTIVITY OR SESSION THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN,
BUT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		TOTALS	
		1	2

	CELL FREQ	0	1
1	% ROW	0.0	100.0
	% COL	0.0	0.8
	% TABLE	0.0	0.5

	CELL FREQ	12	10
2	% ROW	54.5	45.5
	% COL	14.1	8.2
	% TABLE	5.8	4.8

	CELL FREQ	8	7
3	% ROW	53.3	46.7
	% COL	9.4	5.7
	% TABLE	3.9	3.4

	CELL FREQ	8	12
4	% ROW	40.0	60.0
	% COL	9.4	9.8
	% TABLE	3.9	5.8

	CELL FREQ	8	17
5	% ROW	32.0	68.0
	% COL	9.4	13.9
	% TABLE	3.9	8.2

	CELL FREQ	5	8
6	% ROW	38.5	61.5
	% COL	5.9	6.6
	% TABLE	2.4	3.9

	CELL FREQ	10	10
7	% ROW	50.0	50.0
	% COL	11.8	8.2
	% TABLE	4.8	4.8

TABLE 35B

8	CELL FREQ	*	6	*	7	*	13	*
	% ROW	*	46.2	*	53.8	*		*
	% COL	*	7.1	*	5.7	*		*
	% TABLE	*	2.9	*	3.4	*	6.3	*

9	CELL FREQ	*	7	*	14	*	21	*
	% ROW	*	33.3	*	66.7	*		*
	% COL	*	8.2	*	11.5	*		*
	% TABLE	*	3.4	*	6.8	*	10.1	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	1	*	2	*	3	*
	% ROW	*	33.3	*	66.7	*		*
	% COL	*	1.2	*	1.6	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.5	*	1.0	*	1.4	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	9	*	8	*	17	*
	% ROW	*	52.9	*	47.1	*		*
	% COL	*	10.6	*	6.6	*		*
	% TABLE	*	4.3	*	3.9	*	8.2	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	6	*	11	*	17	*
	% ROW	*	35.3	*	64.7	*		*
	% COL	*	7.1	*	9.0	*		*
	% TABLE	*	2.9	*	5.3	*	8.2	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	5	*	15	*	20	*
	% ROW	*	25.0	*	75.0	*		*
	% COL	*	5.9	*	12.3	*		*
	% TABLE	*	2.4	*	7.2	*	9.7	*

	TL COL FRQ		85		122		207	
	% TABLE		41.06		58.94			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 34 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 14.11

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 8.9254 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.7093

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.02996

CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.02198
COLUMN	ROW	0.04706

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 26. IN YOUR OPINION, IS THERE ANY AREA OF EXPERTISE THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN,
BUT WAS NOT REPRESENTED BY SESSION SPEAKERS AND DISCUSSANTS.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	15	67	82
1	% ROW	18.3	81.7	
	% COL	31.9	41.4	
	% TABLE	7.2	32.1	39.2

	CELL FREQ	14	33	47
2	% ROW	29.8	70.2	
	% COL	29.8	20.4	
	% TABLE	6.7	15.8	22.5

	CELL FREQ	9	57	66
3	% ROW	13.6	86.4	
	% COL	19.1	35.2	
	% TABLE	4.3	27.3	31.6

	CELL FREQ	9	5	14
4	% ROW	64.3	35.7	
	% COL	19.1	3.1	
	% TABLE	4.3	2.4	6.7

	TL COL FREQ	47	162	209
	% TABLE	22.49	77.51	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 32 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 13.28

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 19.2630 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.0002

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.02299

CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.00000
COLUMN	ROW	0.08511

TABLE 36A

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 26. IN YOUR OPINION, IS THERE ANY AREA OF EXPERTISE THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN,
BUT WAS NOT REPRESENTED BY SESSION SPEAKERS AND DISCUSSANTS.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

TOTALS

		1	2	

	CELL FREQ	* 1	* 1	* 2 *
1	% ROW	* 50.0	* 50.0	*
	% COL	* 2.2	* 0.6	*
	% TABLE	* 0.5	* 0.5	* 0.9 *

	CELL FREQ	* 8	* 15	* 23 *
2	% ROW	* 34.8	* 65.2	*
	% COL	* 17.4	* 8.8	*
	% TABLE	* 3.7	* 6.9	* 10.6 *

	CELL FREQ	* 4	* 11	* 15 *
3	% ROW	* 26.7	* 73.3	*
	% COL	* 8.7	* 6.4	*
	% TABLE	* 1.8	* 5.1	* 6.9 *

	CELL FREQ	* 5	* 17	* 22 *
4	% ROW	* 22.7	* 77.3	*
	% COL	* 10.9	* 9.9	*
	% TABLE	* 2.3	* 7.8	* 10.1 *

	CELL FREQ	* 5	* 19	* 24 *
5	% ROW	* 20.8	* 79.2	*
	% COL	* 10.9	* 11.1	*
	% TABLE	* 2.3	* 8.8	* 11.1 *

	CELL FREQ	* 2	* 11	* 13 *
6	% ROW	* 15.4	* 84.6	*
	% COL	* 4.3	* 6.4	*
	% TABLE	* 0.9	* 5.1	* 6.0 *

	CELL FREQ	* 6	* 17	* 23 *
7	% ROW	* 26.1	* 73.9	*
	% COL	* 13.0	* 9.9	*
	% TABLE	* 2.8	* 7.8	* 10.6 *

TABLF 36B

8	CELL FREQ	*	4	*	11	*	15	*
	% ROW	*	26.7	*	73.3	*		*
	% COL	*	8.7	*	6.4	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.8	*	5.1	*	6.9	*

9	CELL FREQ	*	4	*	19	*	23	*
	% ROW	*	17.4	*	82.6	*		*
	% COL	*	8.7	*	11.1	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.8	*	8.8	*	10.6	*

10	CELL FREQ	*	0	*	3	*	3	*
	% ROW	*	0.0	*	100.0	*		*
	% COL	*	0.0	*	1.8	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.0	*	1.4	*	1.4	*

11	CELL FREQ	*	3	*	14	*	17	*
	% ROW	*	17.6	*	82.4	*		*
	% COL	*	6.5	*	8.2	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.4	*	6.5	*	7.8	*

12	CELL FREQ	*	3	*	13	*	16	*
	% ROW	*	18.8	*	81.3	*		*
	% COL	*	6.5	*	7.6	*		*
	% TABLE	*	1.4	*	6.0	*	7.4	*

13	CELL FREQ	*	1	*	20	*	21	*
	% ROW	*	4.8	*	95.2	*		*
	% COL	*	2.2	*	11.7	*		*
	% TABLE	*	0.5	*	9.2	*	9.7	*

	TL COL FRQ		46		171		217	
	% TABLE		21.20		78.80			

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 24 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 9.96

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 9.2844 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.6785

		SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :		0.01674
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA		
ROW	COLUMN	0.02073		
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000		

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 27. IN YOUR OPINION, DID THE SUMMER INSTITUTE KNIT TOGETHER THE MANY
COMPONENTS OF THE ED.D PROGRAM.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		1	2	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	* 77	* 2	* 79
1	% ROW	* 97.5	* 2.5	*
	% COL	* 39.3	* 18.2	*
	% TABLE	* 37.2	* 1.0	* 38.2

	CELL FREQ	* 47	* 1	* 48
2	% ROW	* 97.9	* 2.1	*
	% COL	* 24.0	* 9.1	*
	% TABLE	* 22.7	* 0.5	* 23.2

	CELL FREQ	* 62	* 4	* 66
3	% ROW	* 93.9	* 6.1	*
	% COL	* 31.6	* 36.4	*
	% TABLE	* 30.0	* 1.9	* 31.9

	CELL FREQ	* 10	* 4	* 14
4	% ROW	* 71.4	* 28.6	*
	% COL	* 5.1	* 36.4	*
	% TABLE	* 4.8	* 1.9	* 6.8

	TL COL FREQ	196	11	207
	% TABLE	94.69	5.31	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 34 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 14.11

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 17.3345 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.0006

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.01439

CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.01563
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

TABLE 37A

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 27. IN YOUR OPINION, DID THE SUMMER INSTITUTE KNIT TOGETHER THE MANY
COMPONENTS OF THE ED.D PROGRAM.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

		TOTALS	
		1	2

	CELL FREQ	* 2 *	* 0 *
1	% ROW	* 100.0 *	* 0.0 *
	% COL	* 1.0 *	* 0.0 *
	% TABLE	* 0.9 *	* 0.0 *

	CELL FREQ	* 20 *	* 4 *
2	% ROW	* 83.3 *	* 16.7 *
	% COL	* 9.8 *	* 33.3 *
	% TABLE	* 9.2 *	* 1.8 *

	CELL FREQ	* 12 *	* 2 *
3	% ROW	* 85.7 *	* 14.3 *
	% COL	* 5.9 *	* 16.7 *
	% TABLE	* 5.5 *	* 0.9 *

	CELL FREQ	* 21 *	* 1 *
4	% ROW	* 95.5 *	* 4.5 *
	% COL	* 10.2 *	* 8.3 *
	% TABLE	* 9.7 *	* 0.5 *

	CELL FREQ	* 25 *	* 0 *
5	% ROW	* 100.0 *	* 0.0 *
	% COL	* 12.2 *	* 0.0 *
	% TABLE	* 11.5 *	* 0.0 *

	CELL FREQ	* 13 *	* 0 *
6	% ROW	* 100.0 *	* 0.0 *
	% COL	* 6.3 *	* 0.0 *
	% TABLE	* 6.0 *	* 0.0 *

	CELL FREQ	* 20 *	* 1 *
7	% ROW	* 95.2 *	* 4.8 *
	% COL	* 9.8 *	* 8.3 *
	% TABLE	* 9.2 *	* 0.5 *

TABLE 37B

```

      CELL FREQ *   16 *   2 *   18 *
8  % ROW * 88.9 * 11.1 *
   % COL *  7.8 * 16.7 *
   % TABLE *  7.4 *  0.9 *  8.3 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *   23 *   0 *   23 *
9  % ROW * 100.0 *  0.0 *
   % COL * 11.2 *  0.0 *
   % TABLE * 10.6 *  0.0 * 10.6 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *    3 *   0 *    3 *
10 % ROW * 100.0 *  0.0 *
   % COL *  1.5 *  0.0 *
   % TABLE *  1.4 *  0.0 *  1.4 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *   15 *   1 *   16 *
11 % ROW * 93.8 *  6.3 *
   % COL *  7.3 *  8.3 *
   % TABLE *  6.9 *  0.5 *  7.4 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *   14 *   0 *   14 *
12 % ROW * 100.0 *  0.0 *
   % COL *  6.8 *  0.0 *
   % TABLE *  6.5 *  0.0 *  6.5 *
*****
      CELL FREQ *   21 *   1 *   22 *
13 % ROW * 95.5 *  4.5 *
   % COL * 10.2 *  8.3 *
   % TABLE *  9.7 *  0.5 * 10.1 *
*****
      TL COL FREQ   205   12   217
      % TABLE   94.47   5.53

```

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 24 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 9.96

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 13.6297 ; DF = 12 ; P = 0.3250

SYM. TRIC LAMBDA : 0.01961

CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.02083
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

TABLE 38A

ROWS REPRESENT: PRESENT POSITION: 1 = ADMINISTRATION; 2 = BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE;
3 = CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION; 4 = ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 29. WAS YOUR MOST IMPORTANT OBJECTIVE ACCOMPLISHED DURING THE
SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

	1	2	TOTALS
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	75	1	76
% ROW	98.7	1.3	*
% COL	40.1	9.1	*
% TABLE	37.9	0.5	38.4
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	39	4	43
% ROW	90.7	9.3	*
% COL	20.9	36.4	*
% TABLE	19.7	2.0	21.7
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	61	5	66
% ROW	92.4	7.6	*
% COL	32.6	45.5	*
% TABLE	30.8	2.5	33.3
*****	*****	*****	*****
CELL FREQ	12	1	13
% ROW	92.3	7.7	*
% COL	6.4	9.1	*
% TABLE	6.1	0.5	6.6
*****	*****	*****	*****
TL COL FREQ	187	11	198
% TABLE	94.44	5.56	

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 43 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 17.84

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 4.3807 ; DF = 3 ; P = 0.2232

SYMMETRIC LAMBDA : 0.02208

CRITERION

PREDICTOR LAMBDA

ROW

COLUMN 0.03279

COLUMN

ROW 0.00000

ROWS REPRESENT: CLUSTER: 1=BROWARD; 2=CHICAGO; 3=HAMPTON; 4=HILLSBOROUGH; 5=JACKSONVILLE;
6=LONG ISLAND; 7=MIAMI-DADE; 8=NEW HAVEN; 9=ORLANDO; 10=PENSACOLA;
11=SACRAMENTO; 12= ST. PETERSBURG; 13=SAN FRANCISCO.

COLUMNS REPRESENT: 29. WAS YOUR MOST IMPORTANT OBJECTIVE ACCOMPLISHED DURING THE
SUMMER INSTITUTE.
1 = YES; 2 = NO.

			1	2	TOTALS

	CELL FREQ	*	2	0	2
1	% ROW	*	100.0	0.0	
	% COL	*	1.0	0.0	
	% TABLE	*	1.0	0.0	1.0

	CELL FREQ	*	20	2	22
2	% ROW	*	90.9	9.1	
	% COL	*	10.2	18.2	
	% TABLE	*	9.7	1.0	10.6

	CELL FREQ	*	13	0	13
3	% ROW	*	100.0	0.0	
	% COL	*	6.6	0.0	
	% TABLE	*	6.3	0.0	6.3

	CELL FREQ	*	19	0	19
4	% ROW	*	100.0	0.0	
	% COL	*	9.7	0.0	
	% TABLE	*	9.2	0.0	9.2

	CELL FREQ	*	21	1	22
5	% ROW	*	95.5	4.5	
	% COL	*	10.7	9.1	
	% TABLE	*	10.1	0.5	10.6

	CELL FREQ	*	11	1	12
6	% ROW	*	91.7	8.3	
	% COL	*	5.6	9.1	
	% TABLE	*	5.3	0.5	5.8

	CELL FREQ	*	21	2	23
7	% ROW	*	91.3	8.7	
	% COL	*	10.7	18.2	
	% TABLE	*	10.1	1.0	11.1

TABLE 38B

TABLE 30B cont.

	CELL FREQ	* 16	* 0	* 16	*
8	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	*	
	% COL	* 8.2	* 0.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 7.7	* 0.0	* 7.7	*

	CELL FREQ	* 23	* 0	* 23	*
9	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	*	
	% COL	* 11.7	* 0.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 11.1	* 0.0	* 11.1	*

	CELL FREQ	* 2	* 0	* 2	*
10	% ROW	* 100.0	* 0.0	*	
	% COL	* 1.0	* 0.0	*	
	% TABLE	* 1.0	* 0.0	* 1.0	*

	CELL FREQ	* 15	* 2	* 17	*
11	% ROW	* 88.2	* 11.8	*	
	% COL	* 7.7	* 18.2	*	
	% TABLE	* 7.2	* 1.0	* 8.2	*

	CELL FREQ	* 13	* 2	* 15	*
12	% ROW	* 86.7	* 13.3	*	
	% COL	* 6.6	* 18.2	*	
	% TABLE	* 6.3	* 1.0	* 7.2	*

	CELL FREQ	* 20	* 1	* 21	*
13	% ROW	* 95.2	* 4.8	*	
	% COL	* 10.2	* 9.1	*	
	% TABLE	* 9.7	* 0.5	* 10.1	*

	TL COL FRQ	196	11	207	
	% TABLE	94.69	5.31		

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE: 241 NUMBER NOT RESPONDING: 34 PERCENT OF TOTAL: 14.11

PEARSON CHI SQUARE TEST OF ASSOCIATIVITY: 8.9346 1. DF = 12 -> P = 0.7085

	SYMMETRIC LAMBDA :	0.01026
CRITERION	PREDICTOR	LAMBDA
ROW	COLUMN	0.01087
COLUMN	ROW	0.00000

APPENDIX D:
SAMPLE PARTICIPANT LETTER



New York City Community College

OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, 300 JAY STREET, BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201

August 23, 1973

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JAN 18 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Dr. John A. Scigliano,
Director
Nova University
3301 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314

Dear John:

Item III of the Summer Institute Survey "to plan a national participant organization" is of great interest to me.

As president-elect of the International Reading Association for Two Year Colleges may I share with you the nature and purpose of this organization which is:

1. To promote national communication among two-year colleges with special emphasis on research and on practice leading toward the solution of problems faced by members in their professional endeavors.
2. To provide for a scheduled review of existing programs and materials which may prove helpful to the membership.
3. To provide services at the request of members in the areas of professional development, and program organization, implementation and improvement.

May we discuss in greater detail the possibilities of participation by Nova Ed.D. candidates, national lecturers in pre-convention institutes, seminars, workshops and publications of materials which will be of national interest to community college faculties. Can you suggest any resource people that might be contacted to serve in an advisory capacity to make this a most viable organization?

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Lorraine

Professor Lorraine Beltler,
Coordinator, The Allied Health
Learning Center

LB:meg
cc: Dr. Marlene Mitchell
Summer Institute

Home Address:
12 Chester Place, Bronxville, N.Y. 10708